

INDIA . . .

through the

GERMAN EYES

# INDIA THROUGH THE GERMAN EYES

*By the Author of*  
**Four Years of Nazi Europe.**



1944

**THE HERO PUBLICATIONS**

6, Lower Mall,  
LAHORE.

तारीख से ही धाकर बैठ गया। उससे कल ही करना है। एक, बाबा

*FIRST PUBLISHED  
APRIL 1944*

---

*Printed by S Gopal Singh at the Punjab Electric Press  
Mohan Lal Road, Lahore*

*and  
Published by S Durlab Singh Prop Hero Publications  
6, Lower Mall, Lahore*

## PREFACE

As the Russian Steamroller moves over the Eastern Europe the Nazi pebbles and stones are levelled on the ground. The proud German Army, is in full retreat, and the heavy danger which hanged over the North Western frontier of this country, due to threatened German break through in Asia Minor is momentarily lifted up. But though the Nazi military might is crumbling down, their philosophy of hate has not ended. This sordid philosophy helped them to rise to power, and it is based on considering the Indians and other coloured people as inferior beings. The Nazi leaders formulated their policy towards this country as early as 1921, according to Hitler in "Mein Kampf". They took up the attitude that Indians were better under British rule. Then came the speech of Hitler at Dusseldorff Industry-Klub in 1932 declaring that Indians and other coloured people were instruments of technical progress of Nazi Germany. He outlined his plan of Empire building.

The German Press, as soon as Hitler had consolidated power and signed Anglo-German Naval treaty of 1935, returned to the subject again and elaborated Hitler's plan of Empire building. The Fuherer himself encouraging such "planning" by his outburst early in 1936 when he said "destiny of white races was to govern the coloured races" (except of course Japan, which country protested against this statement and Fuherer denied having referred to that country).

Other Nazi leaders who have taken notable part in anti-Indian campaign are Robert Ley, Ribbentrop

Rosenburg. All of them have spoken about the Nazi plans of ruling coloured people including Indians and their utterances form a long indictment of this country. This book deals with the German attitude towards India from the times of Kaiser down to that of Hitler. There was a happy interlude of the Weimar Republic which had sympathy towards the aspirations of this country. For the rest the Nazis and the conservatives have dominated the German political scene and crushed those people who sympathised with thier country.

India has thus every reason to love that other Germany which was ruled by the republicans, and it is only when the present predatory regime of the Nazis is ended in Germany that the German people could formulate a sane attitude towards all countries of the world including India.

MARCH 1944

H. L. SETH.

## CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I The Oppressed meets the Oppressed	... 9
II Hitler on the Jabbering Orientals	... 19
III The Nazi Concept of Empire	... 41
IV Indians and German Citizenship	... 90
V The Wheel comes a full Circle	... 105
VI Ribbentrop, Ley and Rosenberg	... 127
VII India and Germany Today	... 139

### **Publishers' Note**

- (1) *We publish good books on National and International politics. If you can send a good manuscript, it will receive our careful attention.*
- (2) *If you are not already on our mailing list and like to know when new books are published please send in your name and address on a post card.*

## CHAPTER I

### THE OPPRESSED MEETS THE OPPRESSED

The Germans had evinced great interest in the cause of Indian freedom during the last war, but it was not altogether out of disinterested motives and it was limited to a small circle of Chauvinists rather than Herr Schmidt who was not allowed to assert for his own freedom, let alone that of such a far off country as India. The awakening of the vast German masses was yet to come. The interest of a small number of officials in Berlin should be considered on the same footing as Kaiser's solicitation for the Boer cause during the war in South Africa in 1902. Kaiser's telegrams to Kruger were actuated by motives of ousting British Imperialism from South Africa in order to pave way for strengthening of the German brand of it. As they treated Kruger, so did they play with the Nationalist sentiments of a handful of Indians who had assembled in Berlin during the war.

But soon the ruling caste in Berlin collapsed and out of the shambles of the old Prussian State emerged the republic. This little republic had to fight its way to power in face of opposition of the militarists at home and at the same time face the victors of the West, who obsessed with the idea of war guilt of Germany wanted to teach it a grim lesson. This struggle of the freedom minded Germans against England and France after the war made them naturally line up with all those who were victims of these countries and were struggling against them. India was one of such nations and after the war it found a great community of interest with the

Germans. There was little difference between the thoughts of the German soldiers who reeled back in the West after the smashing of the Hindenburg line and the Indian troops returning home from across the "black waters". Both felt that war had been fought in vain. So far as their countries were concerned, it was to lead to no improvement in the existing state of affairs. When they had laid down arms they had hoped that good would come out of this fighting. The Victors would be generous with Germany as well India. The Republican politicians in Germany and the Indian Congress leaders shared the sentiments of their soldiers and believed that a new millenium would emerge out of that war. They trusted Britain and France, but both felt that they had not been given a fair deal by these powers. The German republicans and war-weary soldiers got Versailles treaty; in India they gave us Montague Chelmsford reforms and "preference to disbanded soldiers as chaprasis, railway coolies, gate keepers, postmen etc, etc."

Here as in Germany, people were frustrated and dejected. In both cases the forces ranged in opposition against those struggling for freedom, had proved to be all powerful. The result was that the peaceful Non-violent movement in India, and the more or less violent combat of Germany ended in dismay among the people. \*

There were, however, some redeeming features in Germany. Britain and France could not for long treat it as a semi-colonial country. They feared world opinion and their capitalists anxious to lend money found in Germany a nation which needed western capital to revive German Industry. The astute speculators of the city of London also thought that by such methods they will be able to use Germany as a buffer against Russia.

The Germans survived the storm, which left us prostrate for several years to come

But the misery through which they had undergone and which had not altogether ended prepared them for a new role in world affairs. They had sunk to the level of a colonial country and when they gradually shook off their fetters were admitted to the league of nations and treated outwardly at least on equal terms with western powers, they sympathised with other colonial countries and made common cause with the oppressed. Berlin was once again the welcome home of the Asiatic Students. Anti Imperialists emigre and exiles but what a difference with the other Berlin capital of the Hohenzollern Empire. Then they patronised us those big moustached and whiskered Prussian Generals and junkers now it were the German people who opened their welcome arms to the Indians.

The German people not only sympathised with us they led the movement of all oppressed and played a prominent part at the Congress of the oppressed at Brussels in 1926 where India was represented by Nehru.

The German Press in those days played a prominent part in criticising the French and British Imperialisms for their failings. French intrigues in Morocco and British and Italian in Egypt, Africa, India, China, and Abyssinnia were held up to contempt.

In June 1926 General Hertzog of South Africa made a speech claiming right of self determination for his country. The British made a reply which admitted Africa's right without any parting of power on behalf of Britain. A Kruger, the German Strube in a cartoon in '*Kladeradatsch*' Berlin showed John Bull sitting on a rock in water while at some distance from

him on right and left sat India and South Africa on two rocks holding ends of a string, which John Bull has in his hands and both of them want to snap with scissors the chord which binds them with him. John Bull is reading General Hertzog's speech and saying "Quite Right—I am all for the right of self determination, but can anyone want to be anything but British?"

Another German humorist, Werner Hahmann held up to ridicule the British and Italian interference in Abyssinnia. In a cartoon in 'Magdeburgische Zeitung' he showed a little black boy Abyssinnia standing with a lamb near a League of Nations policeman, and pointing at Britain and Italy in fear, who are standing with daggers in their hands held behind the back. The two are saying to the Policeman, 'why officer, all we want to do is to stroke his little lamb'. The cartoon is sarcastically captioned 'Quite Harmless'.

The same newspaper in December published another cartoon which confirmed the view of 'Kladderadatsch' that the British wanted their possessions to remain under their domination and in tradition bound to the mother country even when they wanted right of self determination. The cartoon in this newspaper was headed '*John Bull und Seine Söhne*'. John Bull's children were shown encircling him, South Africa, India, Australia, China. That represented his youth, and then came old age, and he was shown standing leaning on a stick, while loyally beside him stood the same grown up children attired in British dress and looking every inch like John Bull himself.

This was however no fanciful notion of a journalist sitting thousands of miles away from India or South Africa. The German Press had an inside

knowledge of the British Empire and the way the culture of the ruling race was permeating over the people there. A network of German correspondents spread all over the Empire flashed out stories of the British method of rule and whenever it was found that the regime erred in its treatment of the people, its criticism was severe.

One such case which created quite an uproar in those days was about an Indian domestic servant beaten by a British master in presence of a German correspondent. The correspondent had the news published in the socialist paper "*Vorwarts*". The matter was raised in the House of Commons where Earl Winterton had it talked out. The "*Manchester Guardian*" commenting on it tried to whitewash the matter by saying that it was not reported by the German correspondent to the police, that he had at instance of his wife kept quiet then and only after three months had written to '*Vorwarts*' about it. This seems to be a flimsy excuse.

In the concluding part of the comment an attempt is made to keep foreigners ignorant of the conduct of Colonel Blimps if they get out of control. Says "*Guardian*" —

'It is of course doubly unfortunate that a distinguished foreign journalist should have had the bad fortune to be an eye witness of so unpleasant an incident.. Such incidents, it is true still occur. In part they are inherited from pre British days when the weak were entirely without remedy against the strong. It can fairly be claimed that these incidents are becoming increasingly uncommon. Except in remote districts the law courts are easily accessible and though magistrates and judges are sometimes unduly suspicious of Indians' skill in the concoction of false cases, they

have atleast inspired Europeans with the conviction that the use of physical force is apt to be attended with expensive and humiliating consequences. The fact that Indian servants if maltreated could appeal to courts, was also one of the illusions under which the British liberals in those days lived. How many of the Jewish servants beaten by some Nazi brutes, who employ them, have ever gone to German courts? If courts could be approached, why have not the British liberals advised the German Jews to approach them instead of raising hue and cry about their withdrawal from German possessions and re settlement elsewhere. It was obviously as difficult for the Indian servant then to complain in the court against his British master as it is for Jews in Germany to day. Fear of reprisal, lack of finances or an organisation of domestic servants or even organised public opinion behind them was responsible for a spirit of resignation among the under dog, even if he had reason to complain of his treatment.

Inevitably then it was left to foreign newspapers to take up this cry. The 'Guardian' said, that it was tragic for a foreign correspondent to know about such events. It was not. It was necessary that he should have known it and the way the British liberal papers treated this story, justified its publicity in the German '*Vorwärts*'.

This incident was not an isolated one. In those days racial pride among the European "haves" was common everywhere. In China where the Nationalists wanted to put an end to their semi-colonial state, they were met with opposition from the European vested interests firmly entrenched in Shanghai and Yangtse Valley.

There was sporadic outbreak of riots which brought about immediate reprisals from the side of British and

Americans. The Germans had no vested interests in China at that time, atleast nothing of note. The Pacific islands had been snatched from them by the Japanese; and the same fate fell to their commercial settlements elsewhere in China.

They sympathised with the Chinese struggling against Foreign Imperialism, and thought that it was likely to have repercussions all over the Asiatic Continent.

This provided many other Berlin papers an opportunity to comment sarcastically on the events in China. "Jugend" showed John Bull bewailing in Europe about his loss of treasure in China, and asking Europeans to come and help him in saving it. "Simplicissimus" of Munich struck a serious note in its cartoon which showed the mutilated body of a man with two women standing near it. The young woman asks, "Where is the Father?" to which the other replies, "Civilisation" has taken him."

The later was made in reply to the cry of those who said that they were taking civilisation to China and India, that backward countries were whiteman's burden and he had to educate them.

However this burst of sarcasm against the powers which had tried to enslave them, and hold other countries under their domination, was not to last long in Germany. It had shaken off foreign fetters and breathed a free air for some time, but now new shackles were being prepared for it by its own countrymen—the militarists and the Nazis who believed in sword and might is right and did not understand the championship of the oppressed carried on by freedom-loving Germans. These men, the fallen heroes of the last war had spread German Imperialism in the Pacific, they had dreamed of linking Berlin with Baghdad and

further with India to complete the world hegemony of Germany. While the forces of freedom had been at work in Germany the forces of reaction were also doing their work of stabbing the republic in the back when it tried to grapple with poverty at home and conservatism abroad. Its consistent hammering at Foreign Imperialism should nail the lie of the Nazis that it was friendly to them and was an agent of Jews of England and France and of Bolsheviks of Russia. It was quite the reverse of it. Its one mistake was its lack of unity with the Socialists and Communists at home, and its refusal to purge those colonel Blimps in Germany whose presence in China and India it had deplored.

So towards the close of 1928 we find that the interests of the German people were less and less centred on foreign affairs and foreign Imperialism and more towards home affairs where crises were looming large. Gradually the press gave less space to bloodshed in India or China and more to Communists—Nazi clashes in Germany. The German lovers of freedom were fighting for their existence in their own country. Their condition was not dissimilar to that of Russia to day which is fighting for her freedom and had to give up for sometime the ideas of world revolution. But while Russia has survived the onslaughts of the Nazis the free Germans could not. Their voice was stifled and has till now found no outlet. A good deal of responsibility for the fall of their republic was that of the British and France. The money lent to German Industrialists was used not only to revive trade in Germany but also to finance the Nazis onslaughts on Liberals Socialists and Communists. They cornered the young republic and starved it out. Financial as well as political crisis shadowed the German life after 1928.

And as if the course of history in both countries was to run parallel, the cause of freedom in India was also subjected to a trial in these days. To match Germany's Communists, Fascists clashes, we had the disturbances which came in wake of Simon Commission.

For us the new German revolution had one significance which was lost both to the western conservatives who encouraged it and sentimental liberals who decried it and saw in it rise of a new barbarism. These liberals and labourites of Britain and France had never understood the German republic or sympathised with it as we had. They were near to the tradition of the Social Chauvinists as Lenin called the Democrats of the last war than to the new wave of revolution that was surging over Germany and Russia after the last war. When they sympathised with it they did in a patronising way. To us the lights that had gone out in Germany meant loss of a brave comrade who understood our sufferings and spread them as far as possible to far corners of Europe. Wherever in Europe German was understood and it embraces a good deal of the continent, for as you cross the Rhine in most European countries, German is more widespread than any other European language, the German newspapers, "Vorwärts", "Kladdedatch", "Simplicissimus", "Jugend" and "Magdelburgische Zeitung" found their way. Now the Nazis had assumed full control of these newspapers, whose editors had to find refuge abroad as soon as the Nazis marched in. Was it conceivable that these new rulers of Germany who were filling concentration camps with Democrats or kicking them out of country could ever follow their policy of sympathy with the oppressed? How could they sympathise with us when they were torturing those who had done so?

The groaning cries of the German republic were the cries of the oppressed of the world, who had a few years ago met at Brussels. After Russia, Germany was the only great nation whose giant intellects, powerful press and a highly educated proletariat was behind the cause of the coloured people. Small countries here and there such as Belgium continued to sympathise with us but over them too the shadow of the Nazis was looming large. After the fall of the great bastion of freedom the taking of small pill boxes and block houses was for Nazis a matter only of time.

This other Germany which has emerged after 1932 is entirely alien to us. We do not understand it. It is not of us. While India was busy in 1931-32 with her own struggle, and China was grappling with Japan, overnight the entire old fabric of society in Germany collapsed. Those who stepped in its place reversed the entire policy of the Germany we had known and admired and which had admired us.

## CHAPTER 2

### HITLER ON THE 'JABBERING ORIENTALS'

The attitude of the Nazis towards the oppressed was the one which the Junkers and German militarists had adopted towards those of other races who were unlucky to fall under their domination in the past. These Junkers and Conservatives were their allies now. They moulded the Nazi attitude towards subject races. In spite of Hitler's bantering about Jews and his racial myths the Nazis (including Hitler) were in the beginning, of proletarian or lower middle class origin, and their tendencies as their name the German National Socialist workers party signified were decidedly in favour of the underdog. Under influence of the Strasser brothers they would have adopted a saner attitude towards the oppressed, but for the influence of the Conservatives and the Junkers, which was marked as the time passed on. Hitler drew his inspiration from past. The attitude of contempt of German ruling caste towards Czechs and Poles and other Slavs together with Mussolini's ruthless behaviour towards the coloured people over whose dead bodies in sealed wells he was building up his Roman Empire, influenced Hitler. The German Junkers thought Slavs as slaves to work on their fields to build armaments for them and to provide them with cannon fodder, when they found that there were not enough Germans to serve that purpose. Luckily the Slavs after the war were no longer slaves. They ruled their own land, but the expropriated slave-owners in Germany continued to have the same views about them as they held previously. The Nazis shared this hatred. They thought Germans in Czechoslovakia,

Poland as well as Alsace Lorraine had been handed over to men of inferior blood, and must be rescued, and not only that but the dominions of Germany extended to cover their territory for they had been always subjects of the greater Germany. Such was the racial arrogance towards those Europeans who were also white-men. The coloured people should, therefore, expect much worse treatment at their hands. Men who denied right of self determination to people of Europe, could not champion the cause of such far off countries as India. For Indians Germans had reserved not only slavery which they thought was to be the lot of smaller European nations, but also contempt which Mussolini, Adolf's big brother had been showing towards the coloured races of Africa. The Nazi campaign against India began simultaneously with their campaign against the Slav states of Europe and other small countries whom they characterised as "Jewish". It was also timed with the opening of that other campaign for India by the Free Germans. Hitler criticised these Germans in "Meinkampf" and says —

"As early as 1920-21, the party was approached from various quarters in an attempt to bring it into touch with liberationist movements in other countries. It was on the lines of the much advertised 'Association of oppressed Nations'. They consisted chiefly of representatives of certain Balkan states, also some from Egypt and India who impressed me as being chattering busy bodies with nothing behind them. But there were quite a few Germans especially among the Nationalists who let themselves be taken in by those jabbering orients and imagined that any Indian and Egyptian student who happened to turn up was a genuine representative of India or Egypt. They never troubled to inquire nor did they realise that these were people with nothing behind them and without authority from

anywhere to conclude any sort of agreement, so that the result of dealing with such characters was just nil and mere waste of time. I well remember the childish and incomprehensible hopes which arose suddenly in 1920-21 in Nationalist circles. England was supposed to be on the verge of collapse in India. A few mount-banks from Asia (they may have been genuine fighters for freedom in India for all I care) who ran round Europe had managed to inspire quite reasonable people with the fixed idea that the British world empire with its pivot in India was just about to collapse there. That the wish was father to the thought, never occurred to them.

"It is childish to assume that in England the importance of the Indian Empire for the British world union is not appreciated. And it is a sad proof of refusal to take a lesson from the world war and to realise that determination of the Anglo-Saxon character when people imagine that England would let India go.

"Apart from all this speaking as Germans I would rather see India under British domination than of any other nation."

The blood tracks of Nazi anti-Indian campaign can be traced back to their attempts to subvert the movement for solidarity of oppressed nations. The story about overtures made to Nazis by the representative of the oppressed nations may have been mere canard. The Nazis were in those days hardly a political party, and it is very likely Hitler may have made the outburst against orientals, because of his own aversion to them, rather than any experiences that he may have gained after contact with those people. And in order to give an exaggerated importance to himself he may have written that they came to him. On the other

hand it is also likely that after having contact with the free German parties, Indian representative might have casually sounded the Nazis who were then more under the influence of Gregor and Otto Strasser than Hitler, and had faintly left leanings. The Strassers followed by certain broadminded nationalists might have appreciated the sentiments of the Indians though Hitler had characterised them as 'Jabbering orientals'.

This brings us to Hitler's remarks about sympathy among German nationalists for India's cause. Did any such sentiment exist? Obviously it did among those nationalists who were democratic minded, and some of them might have been in Nazi party in those days believing in its nationalist ideas and hoping against hope that the jingoist element in it would be eliminated. It was not. Instead they were. Their case is on par with those militarists and ultra nationalists as well as Junkers who we have said were elated with pride of being a ruling caste and treated other European nations as well as Indians as slaves. Hitler's rebuke was apparently addressed to this section of Germans, who were becoming quite numerous inside the Nazi party rather than those nationalists who were more or less indistinguishable from the democrats and liberals. It were these people who had been playing with sentiments of Indians during the last war, hoping to extend Berlin Baghdad line to Peshawar and Delhi and keeping India in subjection. These people patronised Indian representatives for their own selfish motives, and some of them might have repeated this dirty trick after the war.

It is relieving to find that Hitler had snapped the chord that bound these people to some of lesser politically mature of our countrymen abroad, who thought that any uniformed or whiskered Prussian we

ilded the influences of a Bis'marck among the German people. Hitler was impatient of the Nationalist deals with "Mountbanks of India". Why? His statement provides an insight into the working of a diabolically cunning mind. He did not, it seems altogether, disown the idea of intrigues with the Indians who could be harnessed to the Nazi party machine. In spite of his racial mania it is clear he could have no objection to these dirty deals provided he could be sure that we could provide him with a Henlein or "Seys-Inquart.

But this mountbank from Austria imagined himself to be a member of a flourishing and dominant nation at whose doors the Indians had come begging for help. Why was he elated? Why did he not admit world-misery and seek to end it by a democratic brotherhood between oppressed nations? Because he was essentially militarist and Jingoist of the type of colonel Blimp with whom he had had much in common, and whose domination in India he did not object. Throughout, "Meinkampf" it would be noted that he had adroitly shifted his attack to Jews and Social Democrats and Bolsheviki, with here and there a jib at France.

He did not want Germans to be free or sympathise with those who were struggling for their own freedom. He wanted to enslave them and the world by spreading myths about Jews, Democrats and Bolsheviki.

Later he was found practising an other policy outlined in "Meinkampf." Russians continuously maligned as Jewish Bolsheviki were now friends of the Nazis.

A similar alternative was resorted to in case of India. The Austrian mountbank who had persistently

treated Indians as half casts among family of nations and as subject people richly deserving the domination of Britain now all of a sudden exhibited sympathy for us. We should note his fiendish dualism. It is typical of the Austrian Imperialists. That other Austrian, the demented Franz Joseph, who was in his tune like Hitler a scourge of Europe and whom Hitler so much maligns had also exhibited such dual policy towards Hungary as well as the other slave subjects of the empire. Sometime he had backed the Hungarians against the Czechs and Croates and others, sometimes the reverse. For centuries this had been the policy of Austrian emperors. Hitler introduced this in world politics.

His friendship for Russia fizzled out and now he is locked in a life and death struggle with that country. The belated respect for India cannot last much longer.

One favour which he has shown to us in 'Meinkampf' and which has been more or less absent in case of Russia is his racial mania about inferiority of the coloured people as compared to the German stock. True the Russians were slaves and therefore deserved contempt but he avoids doing that, reserving his racial hatred for the lesser fortunate of Slav countries who were Germany's neighbours. Russia is attacked not as much for being a Slav state as a Bolsheviki regime which system haunts Hitler as a nightmare. The Jews in Soviet regime are attacked for being what they are but the Russian having built a powerful social and economic system is spared humiliations to which negroïd French and Asiatics are subjected. Today having seen the Bolsheviki at war, Hitler must have revised his opinions about Russians as a race, still further.

Not so in case of India. There was no economic

system here as rival challenging Nazis supremacy of the world. He ridiculed Russians, but they were a world power whose friendship and alliance he might need as he said he would in "Mein Kampf". India in the balance of power game played in 1939 in Europe, could not and did not figure as a powerful nation in the Nazis rear to be feared and respected. While there could be some reason for a temporary alliance with Russia, what reason could there be for a similar move towards this country?

In his remarks quoted above he talks about "Britain" giving way to racial confusion in her machinery of administration. What did he mean by that? Read in the context of the Nazi racial creeds, it meant avoiding intermarriages with Indians as well as keeping them out of responsible jobs in administration. He would have British careful about too much trusting men of the inferior race. In the end he lets the cat out of the bag by saying that speaking as a German, he would rather see India under British domination than that of any other country.

It was not a German view that he was expressing. He was speaking for that small band of Nazi adventurers who looked to England to help them to power in Germany.

Today with balance of power having changed in the East Asia and the Japanese ranged on side of Germany, Hitler would probably have no objection to India falling in hands of Japanese. The latter are also like the Europeans spared racial jibes. They are indeed not attacked in "Mein Kampf", though Chinese, Egyptians, Indians and Negroes are all lumped together.

The Nazi view of race is hardly different from that of certain uncivilised and unarmed negroes of Africa about the white race. These Afrikaners have been overawed by racial superiority of the whiteman.

simply because of his better weapon of warfare. Those of them who are not educated and this is true of us also, respect whiteman for this reason.

The Nazis in spite of the high percentage of education in Germany think like the uneducated among the coloured people. To them a race which has become powerful due to a rapid introduction of scientific methods is an object of worship. They start by worshipping their own people and outside their country they reserve their respect for such people as Japanese, Americans, British and Russians who were all considered as great powers in the days after Germany's defeat. For France they had contempt and thought it negroid. They had defeated it many times and had been defeated by it. Thus then the Nazi view was a crude and primitive one based on awe for the powerful and worship of forces. They wanted to maintain glory of their own country, which they deluded themselves was same as before. It was nothing new. It was not based on any biological factors as Haldane, and others have so often proved. It was smug and religious biology, the kind of nonsense, some orthodox Brahmins in India may still sputter about their superiority or an illiterate demoralised domestic servant of some Europeans talk about 'Sahib Log'. The Nazis begin by parading about example of U S A in keeping itself racially pure, a country which they now revile as Jewish plutocratic state. Says Hitler! — "There are some numberless examples in history showing with terrible plainness how each time Aryan blood became mixed with that of inferior peoples, the result has been the end of the culture sustaining race. In North America the population of which consists for the most part of Germanic elements, which mixed very little with inferior coloured nations displays humanity and culture very different from that of central and south America, in which the settlers, mainly Latin in origin had mingled their blood very freely with that of

the aborigines. Taking the above as an example, we clearly recognise the effects of racial intermixture. The man of Germanic race on the continent of America having kept himself pure and unmixed had risen to be its master and he will remain master so long as he does not fall into the shame of mixing the blood."

Omit the reference to America etc, and it may have been said by some religious *Mulla* to *Mughals* when they came to India. In our own times it sounds very much like sermon of some *Pandit* to his fellow *Brahmins* warning them against mixing with other races.

After he had thus in undertones praised America, the Nazi leader comes out with the lid off and gives us an insight into his primitive philosophy based on the worship of force —

"All that we admire on this earth, science, art, technical skill and invention is the creative product of only a small number of nations, originally perhaps of one single race. All this culture depends on them for its very existence. If they are ruined, they carry with them all the beauty of this earth into grave.

If we divide the human race into three categories founders, maintainers and destroyers of culture the Aryan stock alone can be considered as representing the first category.

"The Aryan race often in absurdly small numbers overthrew alien nations and favoured by the numbers of people of lower grade who are at their disposal to aid them, they proceeded to develop according to the special conditions for life in the required territories—fertility, climate etc, the qualities of intellect and organisation which are dormant in them. In the course of a few centuries they create cultures originally stamped with their own character of the land and the people which they have conquered. As time goes on, however, the conquerors sin against the principle of

polluted with alien blood, that men of inferior races stabbed them in the back etc etc It seems, after the war there will be very little room for such racial mumbo jumbo aimed at deceiving the German people

The exploitation of those inferior races who unlike Jews, can be the Nazi instrument of technical advancement is also proceeding to the plan outlined in 'Mein Kampf' This time Hitler will not have to regret as he does about last war, that inferior races were not used as desired Czechs Slovenes, Serbs, Croats Bulgars, Poles are all at the disposal of Hitler to use the phrase in "Meinkampf" Aided by some of these people he has also been able to overthrow alien races

To Indians this talk of inferior races to harness the needs of the Aryans is plain enough Luckily we have not fallen in their hands, nor offended them by giving an opportunity to 'pollute' their blood or our own by becoming their subjects No Indian woman has married a German though Indian men have in certain cases German wives Hitler has not railed against them as he has in case of Jews

But that is what he would do if he had domination over Indians Unlike the British he would not tolerate any nonsense about Indians marrying German women and he considers you and me as instruments of technical advancement of Germany as if there was not enough of it already Germany is far ahead of several nations in industrialisation but in war time that is not enough She would like to turn India as Czechoslovakia humming with war industries under German control for a southern enveloping movement against Asiatic Russia and China to link Berlin with Tokyo

Tokyo is the destination of the vast German campaign for world hegemony Not that they want to conquer Japan but to be jointly united with it, politically, ideologically as well as geographically

Japanese are no doubt a coloured people but they have more in common with the spirit of Potsdam than any other nation European or Asiatic. They had moreover spread their empire to China, and were making the use of Koreans and Chinese according to establishment of the Hitlerite methods of dealing with inferior races. It is very likely that apart from the Prussian treatment of the Czechs and Poles before the republic Japanese attitude towards Koreans might have inspired Hitler to enunciate the policy of having men of such races as instruments of technical advancement. In any case ties greater than mere political expediency bind Nippon to Hitler.

That they have found a spiritual affinity with the Japanese, is of over the heads of the Indians and the Chinese, for whose civilisation, race or blood they showed scant respect is clear from the attitude of the Nazis ever since their coming to power. Exchange of missions had been frequent between the two countries the Japanese civilians and militarists taking keen interest in Nazi party-rallies and such events as Berlin Olympic games while the Nazis have reciprocated these visits and their leaders who went to Japan have organised Japanese military and Political machine on their line. The fact that in eyes of western countries both were offenders of breach of international Law and League Covenant brought them still closer.

The sending of a military mission to China before the war should be considered as a political move to safeguard German interests in face of growing Russian influence there. The mission was later withdrawn. The Germans never had any ideological affinity with China.

The anti Comintern pact sealed the friendship with the Japanese and brought the two countries nearer.

In January 1936, Hitler made a famous speech about the coloured people. He said that the destiny of the white races was to rule over the coloured races. When the Japanese newspapers protested against it, and some of them said that their destiny was to rule and not to be ruled, the Germans at once made amends by saying that the speech was not aimed against the Japanese but other coloured nations.

The Japanese were exempted from the list of coloured people whom the Nazis held in contempt. Who were these other nations earmarked by the Nazis? The Abyssinians, just then 'Aryanised' by the Italians were of course destined to be ruled by the white races. Hitler had in time come to the rescue of brother Mussolini, who was maligned by the British. He wanted him to go ahead with his exploits in that unfortunate country. What a difference with those early days when German newspapers derided at Italian intrigues in Abyssinia. They said that Italians and British were out to slaughter the lamb held by the little Abyssinian boy. Now the lamb had been killed and even cooked and eaten and no one in Germany could raise voice against it. The Egyptians and the Indians were also included in the category of the coloured and the speech was an invitation to the British to go ahead with their plans in both countries. India had begun to come into the limelight of world press due to the indefatigable efforts of some Indian leaders and the introduction of a new act which Indians resented very much. Hitler's speech was timely warning to the German people not to meddle in Indian affairs and thus forget that they were of superior white race which had to rule over the coloured.

The January 1936 speech dotted the i's and crossed the t's of Hitler's "Hands off India" declaration in "Mein Kampf".

The German dictator knew the game he was playing. He wanted certain territorial concessions in

Europe. The best way was to assure the John Bull that Germans knew that they had to expand, would do so in alliance with him, and without incurring his displeasure. It might be argued that this speech was calculated to spread the idea of Nazi claim to the colonies. This in no way makes any difference in Nazi position towards us. But clearly that was not the German idea at that time. The Germans did want colonies, and the speech may have as one of its aim to remind the younger men about German destiny. But any such representation of German ideas in foreign press was at once contradicted by the German press and Hitler, who said that he was not thinking of the colonies. The Germans had for the present no need for them. They only wanted equality in Europe and as for colonies, when the time came, this question could be peacefully settled between Britain and Germany. What did he mean by equality in Europe? The aim was Saar and Rhineland for the present and Britain's blessing was required for that. The programme outlined in "Mein Kampf" that Germans must first reunite their countrymen in Europe was being followed to a letter. The Nazis in fact said to the British "Let us divide our sphere of world domination. We let you alone in your empire and you should help us to get what we want in Europe."

And they did. The Anglo-Nazi alliance inaugurated officially with the naval treaty with Germany in 1935, was sealed by January 1936 speech of Hitler.

A firm understanding had been established between them, which lasted throughout the coming years upto 1939 while the map in Spain, Austria and Czechoslovakia was changed by the Nazis. The "Times" which speaks for the British Government, began in its columns a campaign for leaving Germany alone in south-eastern Europe. Scrutator the political writer for the paper headed the campaign for what he described as "Non-interference in Slav-Teuton dispute."

Subhas Chandra Bose whom the Nazis have been so much "Henlienisising" of late was in those days in Europe. An admirer of Germany that had emerged after 1933 he was shocked by the January 1936 speech of Hitler. He drew attention of German authorities in Berlin towards it, and was as he told in a letter sent home in those days and published in press satisfied that the speech had been wrongly reported abroad and Nazis never meant the interpretation which the foreign papers attached to it. Any way what the German officials told Bose for his personal satisfaction in no way minimises the gravity of the situation. No official denial about India was ever issued as it was done about Japan and this was another example of the high handedness of the Nazis. They could not exempt every body, for then the speech would have been meaningless.

The explaining away of the speech to Bose should in no way be construed as change of policy. It was probably a polite act towards a foreigner whom the Nazis considered as 'guest'. Such explanations were worst than the actual offence. It was adding injury to insult. Any such attempt to seek explanation from the Germans without the ample backing of show of arms which the Japanese were capable of when they protested to Berlin about the speech was always construed as a sign of weakness. It was the British weakness to protest against Japanese officials' insults to British citizens at Lienstien by merely sending Robert Craigie to tell Japanese Government that 'His Majesty's Government viewed with great alarm etc, etc'. And it was our weakness to act like that. Indians should have made a stern reply. Boycott of German goods and nation wide demonstration should have been the first step in this direction followed by some plain speaking about Hitlerite Germany by Indian leaders abroad. To take a sentimental view of Nazi Germany,

and imagine that it could in any way check the machinations of Diehards in Britain about India, was like the wishful thinking of Robert Cragie, Chamberlain and Halifax about Japan, whom they thought as a bulwark against imaginary Bolshevik *Drang nach Osten* in China and India. The Nazis could not understand any such explanation sought by Bose. They could be only told about our indignation at their mud flinging in one way and that was the force—in this case economic sanctions for that was what India could do at that time.

About the time Hitler was playing to the gallery about the advantages of white domination over the coloured, and baiting in the Japanese as well as the British to connive at his intentions of first dominating in Europe and then elsewhere, Ludendorff, the spiritual teacher of Hitler and the man who led the Nazi Beer Cellar Putsch in 1923 published a book in Germany called "*Der total Krieg*" "The Totalitarian War". In this book he elaborated some of the ideas about races outlined in "Mein Kampf" and Hitler's "fleece the coloured people" speech of January 1936. A General and Kaiser's chief of the Staff, he did not try to appease Britain and Japan as Hitler was doing by his speeches. He believed in inevitability of war to further the racial ideas, and he made no bones about his appreciation of military religion of the Japanese.

He regarded war not as a means to an end but as an end itself—"as supreme act of national self-assertion not as a method but rather as biological phenomenon necessary for the conservation of the race". He accepted Nazi racial doctrine and spoke of the next war as "*der volkischer Krieg*," or "racial war". "Such a war knows no limited aims, it is a life and death struggle. It does not, consist of merely actual hostilities between armies—the theatre of operations extends to entire territories of all the bellige-

rents. The fight is waged against the souls as well as against the bodies of the wide population of the enemy's country, propaganda playing as big part as poison gas. War is the consummation of all national endeavour and absorbs all the material resources and all the physical and mental energies of people. "War is the supreme reality in the life of a nation. All else even in time of peace—which are but a preparation for times of war—must be subordinated to this reality. War is not an instrument of policy, policy is an instrument of war." As a peace loving, not a pacifist nation India would treat with utter contempt all this glorification of war. But in any case if the Nazis and the Junkers chose to have their bowels torn out on the barbed wire or their cities bombed out of existence, it is no concern of ours, apart from the fact that some freedom-minded Germans here and there working at risk of their lives for a free Germany inside the Nazi state may have perished in such a process. In any case the responsibility for their slaughter is that of the Nazi war criminals.

What is our immediate concern is Ludendorff's talk about "der volkischer Krieg," and his acceptance of Nazi racial gospel. "The fight to be waged against souls" and "the policy being an instrument of war." It is these phrases which awaken us to the reality of what Nazis are up to the "volkischer Krieg" must end in domination of the Aryan German race over the coloured people and those of inferior races who were, as Hitler says, to be used as instruments of technical progress. If they are annihilated in this process, it matters little. Ludendorff would have no objection to their use against the alien nation. Wars make new policies according to his view, and one of these policies would be to use the coloured troops, in this will o' the-wisp "racial war,"

The Hitler view ended with domination of the inferior races. It did not visualise a permanent state of war. Ludendorff fills that gap. The "fight against souls" means knocking into our heads the virtues of Prussian militarism and telling us who have not since Asoka's time for over a thousand years ever waged a war into a country across our borders, that war is the supreme reality of nation's life, and we should return to the law of jungle. They would inculcate the same jingoist spirit here against some imaginary enemy of ours as, they did in case of their satellite states Roumania, Finland and Hungary. Our own culture is apparently not good enough for us and so we would be forced to assimilate this doctrine based on force.

Hitler told us that "we were degraded and demoralised. Ludendorff comes and says that he had remedy for our souls and that was the doctrine of war as 'a biological phenomenon necessary for the conservation of the race'. If in case of the great German race it should be necessary to have some millions of its men die in the battlefields to keep the race fresh, the amount of men of inferior race who may die in such a process ought to be hundred times more than that.

Elaborating this remedy for our souls, Ludendorff introduces us to our old friend Shintoism which according to him could prove to be the most suitable religion for mankind. He believes that a uniformity of ideas is necessary in a nation and the best way to have that would be to introduce universal religion, based on doctrine of force. He says —

"A nation's primary need is internal cohesion for without it the army which is an organic part of the nation is without cohesion. This cohesion required a fundamental conformity of belief. These convictions must have a religious character, but they must

"It was a bad mistake to declare war on Russia and France in 1914. As soon as a State has decided to go to war it must at once secure command of the air, so as to hinder the concentration of hostile armies. The industrial centres of the enemy must be bombed. But the air arm is not decisive. Only a vigorous offensive of the land forces can decide a war."

All this has been followed to a letter by Hitler's Generals who must have in this respect grown wiser after the Jap attack on Pearl Harbour.

In view of all this India may any moment expect the Nazi legions to pour down the steppes of Asia Minor and try to fulfil Hitler's dream about destiny of "White races to govern the coloured races."

## CHAPTER III

### THE NAZI CONCEPT OF EMPIRE

Putting together the racial war views of Ludendorff and the Germania of the 'Jabbering' Austrian, it is easy to see what they want. They yearn for an empire. The racial talk is only a smoke screen to hide the real intentions. It is the German inferiority complex that continuously comes up. Living in a democratised and defeated Germany and in dire need of alliance with Blimpism in England. Hitler had necessarily to assure his people frequently that they were a superior race, that their destiny was to rule the inferior races who were merely an instrument of technical advancement of theirs. He felt that this aspect needed to be emphasised so that the German who had begun to lose faith in every thing should cling to his myths about races.

The result of this racial propaganda was that Germans were won over while to such conservatives as Ludendorff, it provided a useful opportunity to blend militarism with racial myths.

It was the triumph of Hitler's policy that such conservatives and junkers had been thoroughly imbued with his ideas. Ludendorff and Julius Streicher represent the two glaring examples of the success of Hitler. He benefitted from their propaganda, and they were in turn encouraged by him. But Hitler would not be what he is today, if he could not rise above the tense atmosphere of racial myths which he had built up around him. Do not for a moment ima-

gine that if he had rebuked you as an Indian in "Meinkampf" and made you feel racially inferior to him and as deserving the domination of the British he had no cut and dried plans to build an empire for himself. He could talk to Indians and to Colonel Blimps in England in different ways, infuriate us and please them and yet he could at an other time reason coolly about German empire and *Labensraum* in colonies, etc. He does not forget that He knows that racial talk might justify his expansionist ideas before some Germans, it might disappoint the coloured people, but it could not frighten them out of their wits into submission or bring Germany any nearer to becoming a powerful nation. For that power a planning with tenton thoroughness is necessary. The reckless years of the twenties were no time for planning. It was time for mob frenzies, tub thumping oratory, and deceiving the German people by high sounding phrases about Germanic race. The Nazis were struggling for a *Labensraum* in Germany.

But their fuherer who could excite other people and yet remain cool himself had even then let drop hints here and there what he wanted to do about the greater *Labensraum*. In "Meinkampf," which was written in those hectic days, he gives us insight into his plans. All this was meant for consumption of the more intelligent among Germans who would have probably without its insertion in that book dismissed his talk about Germanic race as babblings of a lunatic.

But he must put forward a new theory of empire building, a *weltanschauung* which should convince the intellectual Germans as well as the foreign readers about the irresistibility of German claim. For that the previous theories of empire in Germany must be demolished. Since that empire had collapsed and those empire makers were in disgrace, it would not do if he were to talk in the way Bethman-Hollweg, Prince Von Bulow or other Prussian leaders of Kaiser's days did

about German empire. Those men were either dead or down and out. Mud slinging on them was the order of the day. They were obviously wrong, and guilty of war and misery of German people as much as the British statesmen were for the same plight in England. They were being criticised sharply by the social democrats, whose policy was in contrast to theirs. And rightly so.

But did it lie in the mouth of Hitler to speak ill of them, he who was trailing after them and trying to build up an empire on their model? He had no such sentimental regard for those people between whom and his own disciples, the difference was that of tweedledum and tweedledee. If anything the Nazis were more ferocious than the older Prussians. But precisely for this reason he must try to look different from them and become popular with Germans. Sometimes he becomes ridiculous in his attempt, at others he hits the bull's eye.

Dealing with the subject of German colonial expansion, he writes :

"They (the German rulers upto 1918) adopted a formula of "peaceful economic conquest of the world" which was destined to destroy for ever the policy of force which they had pursued upto that time. Perhaps they were not quite certain of themselves at times when quite incomprehensible threats came across from Great Britain. Finally they made up their minds to build a fleet not for the purpose of attacking and destroying, but to defend the "world peace", and for "peaceful conquest of the world." Thus they were constrained to maintain it on a modest scale, not only as regards numbers, but also as regards the tonnage of individual ships and their armaments so as to make it evident that their final aim was a peaceful one.

"The talk about 'peaceful economic conquest of the world' was the greatest folly ever set up as a leading principle in state policy, especially as they

did not shrink from quoting Britain to prove that it was possible to carry it out in practice. The harm done by our professors with their historical teachings and theories can scarcely be made good again, and it merely proves in a striking fashion how many 'learn history without understanding it or taking it in

One wishes one could share the views of Hitler about peaceful expansion policy of the *ancien regime* in Germany. In reading the above one begins to believe that Germany was under a liberal regime in those days, and economically *laissez faire* was allowed to function and the expanding German Industries wanted a peaceful outlet for its articles the world over. That the wicked outside world repressed this liberal peaceful Government and the war was the result of it! This is a good defence of the German war criminals and one is tempted to revise the opinion expressed above about the *perfidy of Hitler in his malicious treatment of the men whose example he follows*. But Hitler, like Darlan is capable of being a double traitor.

He had his own axe to grind by making such statement, which appears to us to be a good apology of the other German Militarist Government. That he was a double traitor, would be evidenced from his next remarks which are outspokenly critical about the *ancien regime*.

But returning to the subject of German policy which Hitler criticises because of being "peaceful, we find that *Laissez faire* and liberalism which are moving forces behind such peaceful economic expansion were always absent in that country. The German economic system never had the freedom of the British or American capitalists in its development. One wishes it had. The Americans had a period of *Laissez faire* in which its capitalists captured the markets of the East, especially China. For a considerable time, these

capitalists influenced the American policy towards China. Sometimes this policy was to China's advantage. A liberal tinge was given to American policy about China, till the bigger trusts came and capitalism in U. S. A. became identical with Fascism in its economic development and the Foreign policy also became cynical, more selfish and restrained. Such a temporary phase of liberalism was conceivable in Germany but German capitalism was always in alliance with German State, which under the garb of being a *Volkstaat* that is the people's Government, harnessed it to its own needs. The German capitalist never felt an initiative for peaceful expansion abroad. Being influenced by the state, if not controlled by it his policy was that of the ancient regime which believed in the doctrine of force. Kaiser Wilhelm never built his fleet, for peaceful expansion and in order to aid *Laissez-faire* in Germany. He built it as an answer to the weight of British Empire. He was no more favourable towards liberal parties than the Weimar republicans were against the Militarists. True liberalism was as much unpopular in Germany after the war as before it.

Not that it could make difference to India. I Kaiser Wilhelm had favoured peaceful expansion policy and encouraged *Laissez-faire* at home this could have brought only a temporary change. Possibly the war may have been delayed by 10 years, and Hitler had appeared on the scene late. By coming somewhat earlier he has been trying to explain the mishap that befall his predecessors, like some stage Manager explaining to the bewildered audience about absence of some stars who had left him in a rage and in whose place he had engaged other persons to do the part.

We know where those stars have disappeared and

why they have disappeared They made immense money out of this scandalous Germanic revivé, and now they have smashed the whole show, and reap the harvest while this new manager tries to band together a similar group of ruffians to deceive the Germans and the world once more, and benefit at their expense The Kaiser's regime collapsed not because it followed a peaceful expansion policy, but because it was going too fast on the war path It had not given too much freedom to the capitalists for a *Laissez faire*, but too little, and brought state control and regimentation of Industry

Sometime the Kaiser may have erred in his calculations and the machinery of assault against the colonial people not set in motion so efficiently due to backwardness of the air arm then but what Kaiser could do to 'spread his Empire with force he did

The latter part of Hitler's view about colonial policy which deals with Britain is based on the same sort of admiration of its methods which has characterised the utterances of such men as Lord Londonderry about Nazi Germany before the war —

" In Germany, however as time went on they encouraged by means of the schools, the press and the comic papers, an idea of British life and even more so of the empire, which was bound to lead to the most ill timed self deception for everything became gradually contaminated with this rubbish and the result was a low opinion of the British, which ended by revenging itself most bitterly The few who gave warnings were either ignored or silenced I remember distinctly the amazement on the faces of my comrades in arms, when they came face to face with the tommies in Flanders After the very first days of fighting it

him that the view expressed in the first part of his statement was in direct conflict with the second. In the first he talks about right methods of empire building and criticises his countrymen for following the path of peace. In the second he praises the very men with whom the first policy if pursued to the end would bring him into conflict. Was it not the height of double crossing? Did he not out Darlan the admiral himself in this clever intrigue? He was fooling the German people as well as the British. It was likely that his mind had not yet fully explored new avenues of Empire building and so he could not articulate his plans. He must have been quite torn between his desire to build empire, and the desire first to gain power in Germany, so that Blimpism should not withdraw support. But even so he knew what he was talking about. He knew what he wanted and waited till his thoughts were matured and the outer world was ripe for bursting them open. "Mein-kampf" was not a plea of his course of action. It was only an outline, and a very pointed one.

A few more years and we find him entirely reversing all this talk about Britain and British bravery, India and Indian inferiority. His press was once again to spread the same gruesome stories about Britain which he rightly discouraged and held up to contempt years earlier. Facts were to be falsified again and self-deception, practised as never before. In this connection his remark about "Ill timed self deception" in the above statement is illuminating. Obviously there are well timed self-deceptions also. A dictator cannot dispense with self deception. He has to practice it often and with fanatical belief. The accurately timed self-deception was to start later,

With passage of years, the mind of Hitler became less inhibited. In Germany by 1932, he had consolidated power and become the leader of a formidable political party. On January 27 of that year he spoke at the Industrie Klub of Dusseldorff to a gathering of enchanted German capitalists. In a long speech he outlined the economic plan of the Germany he wished to build. In this speech he assumes a very serious appearance, but there is not that double crossing or finding of the mare's nests which characterised his views in "Meinkampf".

About British Empire as well his own intentions of Empire building he is more outspoken. Though he drags in social theory, yet he is much more revealing.

The benevolent attitude towards Britain has tapered off. Not that the alliance between Blimpism and Nazism had ended or Hitler could do without British aid. He does not affront them. He is willing to wound, yet afraid to strike. About India, he reminds us that we deserve to be ruled. We are an inferior race. He says, as he said in 1936 speech quoted before that white races should rule coloured races. With remarkable ease he brackets himself with other satiated powers and demands his pound of flesh. He does not mince matters but says what he wants—an Empire.

That is the substance of his haraunge about German Imperial Policy. Let us now follow him in these rooms of the house that Hitler built, pausing every where and examining the interior in detail.

First, the changed attitude towards Britain and India. Discussing the cramped atmosphere in which the Germans have to live and which makes Lebensraum

desirable he says — We have the so called white race which since the collapse of ancient civilisation in the course of some thousand years has created for itself a privileged position in the world. But I am quite unable to understand this privileged position, this economic supremacy of the white race over the rest of the world if I do not bring it into close connection with a political conception of supremacy which has been peculiar to the white race for many centuries and has been regarded as in the nature of things. This conception it has maintained in its dealings with other peoples

Just in the same way Cortez or Pizarro annexed Central America, and the northern states of South America, not on the basis of any claim of right, but from the absolute inborn feeling of the superiority of the white race. The settlement of the Northern American Continent is just as little the consequence of any claim of superior right in any democratic or international sense. It was the consequence of a consciousness of right which was rooted solely in the conviction of the superiority and therefore of the right of the white race. If I think away this attitude of mind, which in the course of the last three or four centuries has won the world for the white race then the destiny of this race would in fact have been no different from that say of the Chinese — an immensely congested mass of human beings crowded upon an extraordinary narrow territory an over population with all its unavoidable consequences. If fate allowed the white race to take a different path that is only because this white race was convinced that it had the right to organise the rest of the world. It matters not what superficial disguises in individual cases this right may have assumed, in practice it was the exercise of an

extraordinarily brutal right to dominate others, (Herren rechtes) and from the political conception was developed the bases for the economic annexation of that world which was not inhabited by the white race; "A famous Englishman once wrote that the characteristic feature of English policy was this wonderful marriage of economic conquest with political domination, and conversely of political expansion of power with immediate economic appropriation—a conjunction which becomes unthinkable directly one of the two factors is lacking. I know it is true, that the view is held that we can conquer the world by purely economic means, but that is one of the greatest and most terrible illusions."

What he says about superiority of white race is nothing new. This attitude of his has been thrashed out in the last chapter. It is an elaboration of his harangues in his autobiography, and now we can see the monstrous body and the legs of the head of the devil which propped up in the "Meinkampf" and judge for ourselves how ugly he is.

The talk of marriage of economic and political power is a re-hash of his "Meinkampf" sermon to the Kaiser Government about their imagined mistakes. He is somewhat bold, links it with white race theory and considers that like other white races he has the right to grab Empire. He is their partner in the world carve up. He is able to lift his head up and no longer tries to hide or camouflage his intentions. The belated marriage of economic and political power is a clever way of saying what in Marxist view would be the swift change from liberal capitalist economy to alliance of capitalism with militarist state making the former subservient to the control of the latter. It is nothing new which he has put out before the members of the

Industrie Klub It is the old jingoist way of solving economic ills and removing the over population Having thus set his task before him, he looks round and examined those Empire builders who successfully expanded at the expense of others Since he is to take the plunge he is frank about what they have done

But did these revelations show that he had all of a sudden turned round and become friendly to us Was it a burst of enthusiasm on his part for the cause of his country ? It would be a mistake to assume that in face of what he talked about the destiny of the white races including his own This statement should be read in the background of his previous one about jabbering orientals In that he said we deserved British rule

Now he says that we deserve to remain in economically low standard of life 'To day we are faced with a world condition which is for the white race in any way comprehensible only if one recognizes as unconditionally valid that marriage of the spirit of domination in political will and the same spirit of domination in economic activity (that is the alliance of capitalists impatient for overseas markets with militarists desirous of aggressions abroad) a wonderful concord which has impressed its stamp upon the whole of the last century and through the consequences of which a part of the white peoples has enjoyed a remarkable development instead of expanding in space instead of exporting men they have exported goods and have built up an economic world system which finds the characteristic expression in the fact that pre supposing different standards of living on the earth in Europe and in most recent times in America also gigantic factories have come into existence while the

rest of the world provides enormous markets for the disposal of goods and enormous sources of raw materials. The white race, however, can in practice maintain its position only so long as the difference in the standard of living in different parts of the world continues to exist. If you to day give to our so called export markets the same standard of living as we ourselves possess, you will find that it will be impossible for the white race to maintain that position of superiority which finds expression not merely in the political power of the nation but also in the economic fortune of the individual.

The low standard of living in India and elsewhere contributes to maintenance of white Industry and so we should continue to live like that while those industries expand and flood our markets with goods.

The diabolic conspiracy behind this plan of Hitler has to be understood in order to realise the extent to which he would go in enslavement of the people of these areas. What he had said about white Industry applies to Britain also.

The protection afforded to the British Industry, the difficulties in ways of Indian Industries and lack of state planning, the employment of cheap labour in Bengal—all these factors contribute to keeping standard of living down in this country. Doubtless British Industry could not thrive if it had not these advantages in India.

Under England's domination our standard of life is low enough, we have to feed the British, capitalist, the civil servant, the army officer. But under Germany we will have to feed the entire nation. Their working class will live the life capitalists here do. German state and the German people are one and indivisible.

Here there are only a few "Sahib log." The Germans are all of them *Herrenvolks* and "Sahib log" for the poor Indian. Life in India with its present poverty should return to the standard of those days when people lived in jungles as primitive tribes. The ghastly plan of economic and political subjection of the world, which he has carried out now was conceived on that day in Dusseldorff Klub, and as if we should have no doubt about our fate, should Germans succeed, he told them that low standard of life here was necessary for prosperity of the white men.

Now we know what precisely he wants from us. No wonder then that his speech was punctuated by cheers of German captains of Industry and remarks of "very true." They were dreaming of exploiting us in a way England could never dream of, those nit wits sitting in Dusseldorff Klub. Hitler rewarded them for their help by the boom in German Industry which followed his four-year plans and which was effected at the expense of Balkan countries. They must be feeling much more elated to day, and hoping for conquering entire Asia with India as base and economically dependent on Germany, just as they conquered Europe with economic *Gleichschaltung* of the Balkans. The British have exploited Indian labour in Assam and Bengal and only in war, some technicians have been sent to England, but Germans, judged from the way they employ European labour at miserable wages, and from the exuberance of Hitler and German Industrialists on that day at Dusseldorff, would find in India a heaven sent opportunity not only to drain its wealth and by economic subjection of the pre-war Balkan type keep its standard of living down, but also to employ cheap labour in a net-work of their industries, and tighten the hold still further. They are

hoping like that. Not since the days of Alexander we have been face to face with such a ruthless enemy, determined to ransack this country. Alexander failed. Germans will not succeed. After outlining a plan of alliance with German capitalists, he returns again to Britain. He must praise the methods of empire building of that country, and this time he not only praises them, but also asks Germans to follow them in laying the foundations of their own empire. As if the ghoulish plan outlined by him was not enough, he would take note of British methods also, so that the teuton savagery and planning of economic and militarist subjection of the colonies, should be blended with Anglo-Saxon ideas of ruling the empire. He says:—

"The different nations further have safeguarded this position of superiority in different ways—in accordance with their individual characteristics—most brilliantly of all perhaps England who has always opened up for herself new markets and immediately anchored them through political dominance, so that it is without doubt conceivable that Great Britain, always supposing that her mental outlook remains unchanged should build up for herself an economic life of her own, more or less independent of the rest of the world. Other peoples have not attained this goal because they consume their mental powers in internal conflicts between differing outlooks on the world and formerly in religious struggles. During the great period, of the partitioning of the world, they doubtless inwardly developed their capacities in these intellectual disputes. Later they sought also to take their part in world economics, but they did not themselves create export markets, nor, did they completely safeguard their control over those markets.

"When Germany, for instance, began to found colonies then the inner conception, this quite

cool sober English conception of the foundation of colonies had already given place to more or less romantic ideas, the transmission of German culture to the world and the spread of German civilization—things which were entirely remote from the thought of the Englishmen in the colonisation period. Thus it was that the practical results of our efforts did not come up to our expectations quite apart from the facts that the object of our concern were in part unable to fulfil our high romantic hopes."

He wanted to maintain the myth that Germans neither knew about any other method of expansion apart from the peaceful economic one, nor had ever followed any. They were learning it from Britain. Incidentally what he says about "mental power of other peoples consumed in internal conflicts and religious struggles" while Britain built up an empire and from which other peoples he apparently means Germany—should be accepted with reserve. England in 16th, 17th and 18th centuries was also torn between several conflicting thoughts - religious as well as political—such as quarrel between Parliament and King, the conflict between Papists and Puritans, American revolt etc. etc. Being an island and with a strong navy she continuously carried on adventures abroad in face of *Weltanschaulichen* or conflicts at home. While Germany lying in heart of Europe was busy with subjugating the Poles.

While this was however a mere rhetoric trick of Hitler for the Germans it applies exactly to our condition. Our condition worsened because of this *Weltanschaulichen* among us. If India had not been torn into so many petty states, it should have been politically and economically in a better state.

And to-day also, when we feel the Japanese and German danger, *Weltanschaulichen* is there. Hitler

obviously knows about it, and he would take advantage of the conflict here between forces of freedom headed by Congress and reactionaries led by League, Akalis, Hindu Sabha and the States, just as he took in Balkans. If he can exaggerate conflict in the past history of a country to suit his ends (when such conflict existed in Germany only as much as it did in other countries and England was as much hampered in Empire building by it as Germany was) then he must have a particularly sharp eye for *Weltanschaulichen* in a country like India, where it has existed these three hundred years. An interesting addition has been made by him in his charges against the Russian rulers, by saying that what they wanted was spread of culture to these areas.

This could be true only if it were true that ever any attempt was made at peaceful economic expansion by the Germans. It is the characteristic of liberal capitalist economy that culture does thrive in it independently and finds an outlet in other countries, till capitalism has entered a process of disintegration and sought alliance of state to bring about a Fascist coup. Spread of kultur by German colonists could be conceivable if there had been any such economic system in Germany and if the German state had any idea of the kultur except that of militarism which might have influenced the countries under their subjection. German possessions never benefitted from any spread of German kultur, and romantic ideas may have been limited to such men as Hitler, who had never visited those places and dreamed about them in Germany. It cannot be denied that certain individuals in Germany might have thought of taking the heritage of Goethe, Heine, Kant and Wagner to German possessions abroad, just as they thought about democracy and *laissez-faire* in Germany, and just as

many Englishmen do to day about giving freedom to India. But this idea was never translated in action

Some idea of spread of German kultur can be had from the attitude of Rosenberg, Ley and Ribbentrop towards the countries of eastern Europe and the Nordic people of Scandenavian countries before the outbreak of the war. Their efforts had been directed towards knitting together the Aryan population of these countries after consistent propaganda about race, capitalism and Anglo-Saxon people, so that they become completely subservient to Germany and contribute to subjection of the country which they have adopted as their homeland. We have no such Aryans to tempt Germans spreading their kultur. Though we are ourselves Aryans, yet Germans do not consider us that, and besides Hitler tells us we were in past unable to fulfil high romantic hopes of those Germans who were out to spread kultur in the world. Apparently it was our racial inferiority, which was responsible for lack of intelligence to assimilate German culture so probably he does not believe in wasting any time on us, nor do the " neo Romantic Germans " who are his disciples, Rosenberg, Ley and Ribbentrop. The Balkan methods of spread of kultur cannot be employed here on Indians. So the Nazis would like to follow the methods of force in foundation of colonies.

It is left to the Nazis to idealise cruelties, and to rationalise crimes. The crimes they committed in those days in streets of Germany against unarmed workers and later on in concentration camps, were apparently an " inner conception quiet, cool, sober, German conception " of Government. Accustomed to characterise their own brutalities as sensible and sober acts of German justice, they took the same view of others.

And having said so much and hinted at what sort of *Kulturkampf* he would like for coloured people he begins to parade about that impossible combination of white powers to share the earth, which plan was contradicted by the blatantly aggressive and selfish designs of Germany that he had given vent to in his speech, he said :—

“ The world situation to-day may be briefly stated. Germany, England and France, so far as it belongs to the white race, have gradually increased to such an extent numerically that the maintenance of such gigantic population would appear to be guaranteed only if the economic possibilities for the export of goods in the world are secured. Thus it is in fact the case that a part of the world is absolutely dependent upon the maintenance of a state of affairs which we Germans as democrats and League of Nations folk have long since mentally refused to countenance. The result is clear, competition drove the European peoples to an ever-increasing improvement in the methods of production, and this increasing improvement of methods of production led to a permanent encouraging in the number of men employed. As long as the continuous opening up of the new world export markets kept pace with the reduction in the number of men employed, those who were withdrawn from work in agriculture and later in handicrafts could always be easily transferred to new productive activity, so that we may regard the characteristic features of the last century as being that men no longer needed for agriculture could be transferred to handicrafts, but that later in the handicrafts themselves through rationalisation in the methods of production more and more men became unnecessary and then these could in their turn find new possibilities of earning a

livelihood in a further expansion of branches of production.

"The world situation to-day can be briefly stated Germany, England, France and further—but not by reason of compulsion—the American union together with a whole series of small states, are industrial nations dependent on export. After the close of the war all these people were faced with a world market comparatively emptied of commodities. Methods in industry and in factories had been improved especially on the scientific and theoretical sides with vast ingenuity on account of the war, and armed with these new methods men rushed into this great void, began to remodel their works to invest capital and under the compulsion of this invested capital sought to raise production to the highest possible extent. This process could continue with success for two, three, four or five years it could be continued successfully for a further period if new possibilities of export could be created which should correspond with rapid increase and improvements in production and its methods. This was a problem of primary importance, for the rationalization of business which began in the sphere of agriculture leads to a reduction in the number of men engaged in work a reduction which is useful only if the men thus turned out of employment can be easily in their turn transferred into new branches of economic activity. But we see that since the world war there was no further important extension of export markets. On the contrary we see that relatively those export markets contracted that the number of exporting nations gradually increased and that great many former export markets became themselves industrialised while finally a new wholesale exporter—the American union—which perhaps to day is not yet

all-powerful in all spheres, but certainly in individual cases can reckon on advantages in production which we in Europe assuredly do not and cannot possess "

League of Nations, over population, improvement in technique of production and simultaneous fall in number of men employed, dwindling export markets, these were new burdens that sapped the very energy of the white people. Some of them had to be maintained such as improved technique in production while other burdens could be somehow dislodged from their head. The League of Nations could be done away with. The surplus population and the men who could not be absorbed in any industry could be packed off to colonies or taken in new industries to be opened, as soon as wider markets were available. All this was said at a time when economic crisis had enveloped the entire world and western nations were anxiously thinking as to how best to tide over their difficulties. The German redeemer was at hand. He was telling them what to do ! So optimistic he was that before he had tried these methods at home he was calling for a solidarity of the white nations a *Kultursolidaritat* or solidarity of civilization in face of the crisis looming large on horizon. After having consolidated power in Germany though without getting himself into office, he was bidding for leadership of the western nations or trapping them into it for mutual benefit. In Germany, he had raised some aunt sabbies to achieve progress. The Jews, Democrats, Weimar constitution, communists, these were used as *raison d'être* for the rise of the Nazis. They were blamed for ruin of Germany. In international field some such troubles, imaginary or real, had to be created in order to have the *Kultursolidaritat*. But altogether his remedies were too comical to be seriously entertained by satiated Im-

livelihood in a further expansion of branches of production.

“The world situation to-day can be briefly stated Germany, England, France and further—but not by reason of compulsion—the American union together with a whole series of small states, are industrial nations dependent on export After the close of the war all these people were faced with a world market comparatively emptied of commodities Methods in industry and in factories had been improved especially on the scientific and theoretical sides with vast ingenuity on account of the war, and armed with these new methods men rushed into this great void, began to remodel their works to invest capital and under the compulsion of this invested capital sought to raise production to the highest possible extent This process could continue with success for two, three, four or five years it could be continued successfully for a further period if new possibilities of export could be created which should correspond with rapid increase and improvements in production and its methods This was a problem of primary importance, for the rationalization of business which began in the sphere of agriculture leads to a reduction in the number of men engaged in work a reduction which is useful only if the men thus turned out of employment can be easily in their turn transferred into new branches of economic activity But we see that since the world war there was no further important extension of export markets On the contrary we see that relatively *those export markets contracted that the number of* exporting nations gradually increased and that great many former export markets became themselves industrialised while finally a new wholesale exporter—the American union—which perhaps to day is not yet

all-powerful in all spheres, but certainly in individual cases can reckon on advantages in production which we in Europe assuredly do not and cannot possess "

League of Nations, over population, improvement in technique of production and simultaneous fall in number of men employed, dwindling export markets, these were new burdens that sapped the very energy of the white people. Some of them had to be maintained such as improved technique in production while other burdens could be somehow dislodged from their head. The League of Nations could be done away with. The surplus population and the men who could not be absorbed in any industry could be packed off to colonies or taken in new industries to be opened, as soon as wider markets were available. All this was said at a time when economic crisis had enveloped the entire world and western nations were anxiously thinking as to how best to tide over their difficulties. The German redeemer was at hand. He was telling them what to do! So optimistic he was that before he had tried these methods at home he was calling for a solidarity of the white nations a *Kultur-solidaritat* or solidarity of civilization in face of the crisis looming large on horizon. After having consolidated power in Germany though without getting himself into office he was bidding for leadership of the western nations or trapping them into it for mutual benefit. In Germany, he had raised some Aunt Sallys to achieve progress. The Jews, Democrats, Weimar constitution, communists these were used as *raison d'être* for the rise of the Nazis. They were blamed for ruin of Germany. In international field some such troubles imaginary or real, had to be created in order to have the *Kultur-solidaritat*. But altogether his remedies were too comical to be seriously entertained by satiated im-

livelihood in a further expansion of branches of production.

"The world situation to-day can be briefly stated Germany, England, France and further—but not by reason of compulsion—the American union together with a whole series of small states, are industrial nations dependent on export After the close of the war all these people were faced with a world market comparatively emptied of commodities Methods in industry and in factories had been improved especially on the scientific and theoretical sides with vast ingenuity on account of the war, and armed with these new methods men rushed into this great void, began to remodel their works to invest capital and under the compulsion of this invested capital sought to raise production to the highest possible extent This process could continue with success for two, three, four or five years it could be continued successfully for a further period if new possibilities of export could be created which should correspond with rapid increase and improvements in production and its methods This was a problem of primary importance, for the rationalization of business which began in the sphere of agriculture leads to a reduction in the number of men engaged in work a reduction which is useful only if the men thus turned out of employment can be easily in their turn transferred into new branches of economic activity But we see that since the world war there was no further important extension of export markets On the contrary we see that relatively those export markets contracted that the number<sup>1</sup> of exporting nations gradually increased, and that great many former export markets became themselves industrialised while finally a new wholesale exporter—the American union—which perhaps to day is not yet

all-powerful in all spheres, but certainly in individual cases can reckon on advantages in production which we in Europe assuredly do not and cannot possess."

League of Nations, over population, improvement in technique of production and simultaneous fall in number of men employed, dwindling export markets, these were new burdens that sapped the very energy of the white people. Some of them had to be maintained such as improved technique in production while other burdens could be somehow dislodged from their head. The League of Nations could be done away with. The surplus population and the men who could not be absorbed in any industry could be packed off to colonies or taken in new industries to be opened, as soon as wider markets were available. All this was said at a time when economic crisis had enveloped the entire world and western nations were anxiously thinking as to how best to tide over their difficulties. The German redeemer was at hand. He was telling them what to do! So optimistic he was that before he had tried these methods at home he was calling for a solidarity of the white nations a *Kultursolidarität* or solidarity of civilization in face of the crises looming large on horizon. After having consolidated power in Germany though without getting himself into office, he was bidding for leadership of the western nations or trapping them into it for mutual benefit. In Germany, he had raised some aunt sallies to achieve progress. The Jews, Democrats, Weimar constitution, communists, these were used as *raison d'être* for the rise of the Nazis. They were blamed for ruin of Germany. In international field some such troubles, imaginary or real, had to be created in order to have the *Kultursolidarität*. But altogether his remedies were too comical to be seriously entertained by satiated im-

perialisms of western countries. So far as England was concerned, she was tiding over her economic troubles by such methods as means test calling of economic conferences and hobnobbing with empire countries to relieve pressure on British industry. She was more or less successful in it. The French were also resorting to similar methods, and had begun to absorb some of their workers in armaments which they wished to build in face of danger of Germany. They had also the habit of quickly changing their governments, and thus ventilating their ill-humour on their own politicians instead of indulging in any hunt of new markets.

Everything considered, there were still many of those whom Hitler sarcastically described as "League of Nation" folk in Germany. It was not an easy matter to dislodge them from their position of prominence in public eye.

But it was doubtful if the British and French ruling class could think of expansion in the world. They had expanded already enough. How could they respond to these cries of Hitler for more expansion at the expense of the coloured people. Besides it was funny to see this man talking about *Kultursolidaritat* of white nations in 1932, when he had continuously reviled all of them from 1921 onwards. Some more, some less, outspokenly, others guardedly yet he had abused all of them as responsible for Germany's misery and won power on such slogans. He had in case of England praised its conduct in empire and upheld its right to have one, but he had been very bitter about England's treatment of Germany. He had to be if he was to have any popularity in Germany. In case of France he had called that country "negroid" etc., and had been less scrupulous in his criticisms than in case of England.

Now that he had almost come into power, he was turning round and saying that lack of export markets, improvement in technique of production, population, etc., were cause of trouble of all. He could'nt say he wanted expansion for Germany alone. That would have sounded too selfish and crude. He demanded for all, a joint carving up of the world. The British and French conservatives who had backed him all along inspite of his criticism of their countries which in fact they encouraged for they believed in justice to Germany, now realised that what he was putting forward was an impossible plan, which could never be acceptable to their public. Hitler was wise enough to sense as much. He knew that such an offer of *Kulturso-lidaritat* under whose smoke-screen he wished to pursue unabashed the designs of Nazi Imperialism, would prove a "flop", if it was not based on some *Weltanschauung* which could rally the public opinion in those countries to his side. Besides by that time he had excited the thoughts of the German captains of industry sitting in the *Dusseldorff Klub* to feverish pitch by painting before them beautiful visions of a limitless industrial expansion as a result of acquisition of vast markets, and as he was not a *Reichkanzler* as yet with powers to mould the policy of the state, nor they able to translate the dreams of an expanded *wirtschaft* into action, the atmosphere must have begun to seem unrealistic for such continued tension which his speech was creating. It was no doubt a case of imaginary apple and imaginary boys. He could not for long thus arrogate to himself the powers to frame a policy for German people as well as the white races abroad. These captains of industry had also to be satisfied so that they should rally after him. He had therefore to stop that planning in the air about joint carving up of markets and expansion of German trade. We find him

in this desperate situation turning to his old obsession Bolshevism. He told the German and the British admirers of his that that was the real menace, but for which they could have long become prosperous.

But Bolshevism in this talk about white races their *Kultursolidarität* and economic expansion at the expense of the coloured people had to be introduced in such a way that it should appear that the solidarity was being prevented by it. So Hitler said — And as the last momentous feature we regard the fact that parallel with the gradual growth of confusion in the thought of the white race in Europe a *Weltanschauung* has seized a part of Europe and a great part of Asia which threatens to tear this continent out of the framework of international economic relations altogether a portent which to day German statesman still appears to neglect with an astonishing levity. When for instance I hear a speech which stresses the necessity for the German people to stand together then I cannot but raise the question. Does one really believe that this standing together is any longer merely a question of political goodwill? Cannot people see that in our midst already a cleavage has opened up a cleavage which is not merely a fancy born in the heads of a few persons but whose spiritual exponent forms to day the foundation of one of the greatest world power. Can they not see that Bolshevism today is not merely a mob storming about in some of our streets in Germany, but it is a conception of the world which is in the act of subjecting to itself the entire Asiatic continent and which to day in the forms of a state stretches almost from our eastern frontier to Vladivostok.

This laboured subject of Bolshevism, which Hitler had held up as menace *ad nauseam* in most of the speeches he had made since 1923 was now given a fresh appearance. No wonder that an English commentator

describe this speech as a triumph of Hitler's oratory. It was formerly he used to hold up Bolshevism, as the disruptive force in Germany. He said Germans were being torn asunder by it. There was obviously lessened now to harp on this idea, for Hitler could not tolerate existence of communist party in Germany, and he had suppressed it, thus leaving it to individuals and groups here and there "to plot against his state. With remarkable innocence he said that when people talk about disunity among Germans he was reminded of Bolshevism which was not only a mob storming in German streets, but a *Weltanschauung* with a great power behind it. As if the talks about German disunity had been carried on by any body else with the same zeal as the Nazis displayed in concocting stories about disruptive forces of Bolshevism. It seemed other people had been interested about the matter while Hitler, the defender of the white *kultursolidarität*, was concerned with the extension of white civilisation in Asia as this *Weltanschauung* of Bolshevism spread in Europe. That was how he gave a fresh twist to the propaganda against Bolshevism. It is obvious that he was employing the same tactics with western powers which he had employed in Germany. There Bolshevism was shown as a menace ready to swallow up German kultur and its past heritage. In international sphere Bolshevism was shown as the enemy of the white races. It was suggested that it would spread as a new religion and would overthrow both Christianity and White race. Said Hitler "With us the situation is represented as if here it was merely a question of purely theoretical problems of views held by a few visionaries or evil disposed individuals. No!

A *weltanschauung* has won over to itself a state and starting from this state it will gradually shatter

the whole world and bring it down in ruins Bolshevism if its advance is not interrupted will transform the world as completely as in times past did Christianity In 300 hundred years people will no longer say that it is a question of a new idea in production In 300 years perhaps people will realise that it is a question almost of a new religion though its basis is not that of Christianity In 300 years if this movement develops further, people will see in Lenin not merely a revolutionary of the year 1917, but the founder of a new world doctrine honoured perhaps as Buddha It is not as if this gigantic phenomenon could simply be thought away from the modern world It is a reality and must of necessity destroy and overthrow one of the conditions of our continued existence as a white race We see the stages of this process first the lowering of the whole level of civilisation and thereby the capacity to welcome civilizing influences lowering the whole level of human society and therewith the surrendering of all relations towards other nations, then the construction of an independent system of production with the help of cliches borrowed from capitalist economics and then as the final stage its own production to the complete exclusion of other countries which naturally in those districts near its frontiers will one day find it the most serious economic rival

I know very well that gentlemen of the Reich-ministry and gentlemen representing German industry will object We do not believe that the Soviets will ever be able to build up an industry which can really be capable of competing with us Gentlemen, they could never build up such an industry if they were confined to the national resources of Bolshevik Russia But this industry will be built up by elements of value drawn from the white peoples themselves It is

nonsense to say that it is impossible to build up an industry in Russia through forces supplied by other peoples. On the past it was possible through the help of Germans to equip industry in Bohemia with all that was needed. And besides that the older Russia was already in possession of some industries.

And if it be further stated: "The methods of production will never be able to keep pace with our own--do not forget that a lower standard of living will fully compensate for any advantage which we perhaps possess in our method of production ('very true'). In any event if European and American modes of thought remain in the future as they are to-day—we shall find that Bolshevism will gradually spread over Asia. Thirty or fifty years, when it is a question of *Weltanschauungen* count for nothing. Three hundred years after the death of Christ, Christianity had only begun slowly to penetrate the whole of the south of Europe and it was seven hundred years later before it mastered the north of Europe. *Weltanschauungen* of this fundamental character can, still five hundred years after their rise, display their absolute capacity for conquest if they are not at the outset broken by the natural instinct of self-preservation of other peoples. But if this process continues for another thirty, forty or fifty years, and our outlook still remains unchanged, it will not then, gentlemen, be possible to say "How does that concern our economic life?"

Not much was heard about this 'Russia as menace to white race' talk during those years immediately following the last war when Germany was being treated as a pariah among white nations. So far as India is concerned, this bracketing of Russia with coloured races, and its description as Asiatic should be welcome. But it is at the same time revealing too of the changed

German mind The Germans in twenties were united in looking to Russia for help and sympathy. The Nazis who reviled Russians as Bolsheviks, never talked about Russia as a menace to the white race Hitler's talk about "Russia or Britain alliance" in "Meinkampf" was based on simple calculations of power politics It had nothing to do with sentimental attachment for white races, or description of Russia as a menace to them The *Reichswehr* was sending its men for training in Russia and the Nazis tacitly approved of these plans of German re armament Hitler though he was always praising Britain could and did not forget the German defeat and the peace treaty

Also he held the view that Russia could be used alternatively as a German ally if alliance with Britain fizzled out Later on this view was changed as a result of frequent conflict with German Communists But the Nazis could never shake off their doubts about England, France and U S A. to offer a common front against Bolshevism Now that German re armament had made considerable strides as a result of Russian help and Germany was able to raise her head high among the nations Hitler was talking about Russian menace to the entire white civilization, and calling for an alliance between white powers No German patriot could ever do that. Only ungrateful German Fascists could forget the help of Russia and turn round and strike at that country. True, Great Britain also contributed to German re armament, and Russian and British policy about Germany was identical in years following the armistice yet Britain had its own axe to grind It was pouring its money into Germany not out of sympathy for an oppressed nation, but to strengthen the hands of the conservatives Its aim was thus to eliminate Soviet influence, and create parties which

would keep Germany out of the camp of the Bolsheviks.

Russia on the other hand wanted a German republicable to stand on its legs, tolerant towards the parties of the left encouraging free loim at home, and aiding her in her campaign of freedom in other countries. The Nazis hitching of the German star to the band wagon of the "white races" should be therefore considered as an act of betrayal towards the country, which had signed the treaty of Rapallo with Germany consistently worked for German greatness and had been a great inspiration to freedom minded Germans.

So far as India is concerned, it should be a grim warning to us for if they could throw away the friendship of their benefactors, and turning hostile, make an assault on this bastion of freedom, not much loyalty could be expected from Nazis towards any other Asiatic country except Japan which shared their philosophy of force

We have no right to dispute their branding of Russia as the enemy of the white races. Apart from the fact this was regrettable due to the past support given by Russia to Germany, the Nazi action should be read in its true background. Russian example was not only an inspiration to millions of Germans to work for *Friestaat*, but to the entire oppressed people and in particular the people of Asia. The Nazis did not like it, because they found that their *Weltanschauung* about Asia was in direct conflict with that of the Soviets. The former wanted to enslave Asia and the latter to liberate it. Why were the Nazis worried about spread of Bolshevism in Asia and canonising of "Lenin as another Buddha"? It was because it would have been impossible to make Asia a base for Nazi *Weltanschauung*. Hitler wanted himself to be canonised as

a Buddha instead of Lenin's occupying that place and that was why he was making slashing attacks on spreading of Bolshevism to the East. The persistent mention of Asia instead of Prussia or Bavaria or any other part of Germany as was his wont in past is also due to a desire to please England and America who had both their interests at stake there. The British people could not be persuaded to join the *kulturso'dan* tat because they were satisfied with League of Nations, over population, or lack of exporting markets, etc, reasons which were previously enunciated by Hitler but they could be made to rally to his side if he said that British empire was in danger due to spread of Bolshevism. They felt he was right because the ruling class had persistently told them how widespread the propaganda of the Bolsheviks was in Asia. This "Russians are after your empire" scare proved as successful in Britain as the "Zinoviev letter" cry of 1922 raised by the Conservatives to win the election.

Hitler was planning a similar coup in Germany as the Conservatives did in 1922. He was paving the way for its good reception in western countries by telling them how eminently sensible it would be to have him in power in Germany, which could become in central Europe a bulwark against Bolshevik drive to the west.

Incidentally though England and America were in those days too pleased about his remarks of solidarity of western civilisation against the 'Barbarian from the East', they might have as well tried to take note of his remark "In any event if European and American modes of thought remain as the former as they are to day .. spread of Bolshevism was inevitable. They had not only to range themselves on his side to form a 100% white block but also to charge their modes of thoughts he might have said 'demoplutocratic modes of thought' but he reserved that for other times. It

was clear to see that he was telling his supporters in those countries to adopt the Nazi mode of thought not only about spread of empire, in which they were of course masters themselves and required to be taught little, but at home too

Hitler had become much more outspoken and bold in his utterances. He not only wanted Germany to be imbued with his philosophy of hatred and war, but the entire world to follow in his footsteps. His western friends did not pay much heed to these words then. They were as much under the influence of his rhetorics as the industrialists who shouted out 'very true' at his remarks about 'menace of Russia'. He had not told that among the two countries, which aided Russia most in this rapid industrialisation so far, one was Germany (the other America). He did not mention that fact.

Apart from that it was a big lie to call Russian industry as menace to the German. The Russians were not building industries to compete with other countries, but to make Russia self sufficient. Hitler's Germany upto 1937 continued to help industrialisation of Russia. Evidently he knew while he was speaking that the economic reapproachment begun by the Weimar republic with Russia was to continue for long yet, whoever ruled Germany. But he cast a discreet veil over his intentions. It would have spoiled the dramatic effect of his speech if he mentioned the need of closer economic collaboration with Germany and Russia.

This German captain of industry were an indispensable link in this vast chain which he was building up for the German people, and they might have been annoyed by such reference to Russia.

Hitler once said in a speech in 1923 " There are two things which can unite men, common ideals and common criminality. We have inscribed upon our banner the great Germanic ideal and for that ideal we will fight to the last drop of our blood

What united him with Colonel Blimps in England and Lindbergs in America, and the German captains of industry, was not common ideals, but common criminality. This was the new German banner which he was carrying forward. As for fighting to the last drop of German blood to force other nations to be a tool in the hands of Germans so that they should carry forward this criminality the world over, for several years after Hitler's coming to power no German blood was shed to expand Germany and even now it has not come to shedding the last drop of blood of the Germans. The Germans are for the present fighting to the last drop of blood of the Romanians, the Hungarians, the Finns, the Italians and the Austrians.

The Conservatives of western countries played the role of these present satellites of Hitler so long as fair weather lasted in Germany. The Nazis after the Dusseldorf Industrie Klub speech consistently drummed into the heads of the British people that the Bolsheviks were enemies of the British empire, and their rivals in hegemony over Asia. They took upon themselves unasked the task of saving the smaller nations of Europe from Bolshevism. While this process of *Gleichschaltung* continued in Europe the Nazis had remained discreetly silent about the colonies and the empire. But when the white front collapsed after Munich, and it was clear that the German aim of empire could not be side tracked the Nazis tried to make German people empire minded. Hitler had already following the blood tracks of Italian Imperial-

'lism in Abyssinnia made in 1936 a speech about the coloured races. After that from time to time he had talked about German claim of colonies, and that it was a matter of peaceful adjustment between Britain and Germany. But clearly the conflicting interests of Germany and England could not for ever be patched up. These conflicts were visible when he made that speech at Dusseldorf, but it seems he was not anxious to increase them, for fear of withdrawal of the support of the Blimps.

Now he had fulfilled his promise to the Germans Meinkampf that till all the Germans were not united in the Reich, they had no right to ask for colonies. That right was established. In course of these years his plans about empire and how to govern it had quite matured. He had no need now to clothe them in garbled racial mythology as he had done in "Meinkampf" nor to hesitatingly outline them, and then switch on to menace of Bolshevism, which provided as a cloven hoof to hide his real intentions. The German press on March 10 1939, published the following nine points about Nazi empire building which had been obviously inspired by the "fuherer."

(1) Natives must not be educated so as to acquire the manners and habits of European civilisation.

(2) European civilisation and technical progress are the unique creation of Nordicman and of the Aryan spirit. They are not suited to native population.

(3) Only those of German and kindred blood can be citizens. Natives must have their own political order.

(4) There must be no intermarriage between Germans and Natives in German colonies.

(5) Natives must be educated in their civilisation (kultur).

the latter, our lot was to be much worse. That it meant returning to the early life of jungle and if Germans allowed to accomplish their plan, they would with their Teutonic thoroughness reduce us to the same state which was prevalent here three or four thousand years ago. Now we know that not only were we to be enslaved and kept ignorant but also to be denied of all prospects progress towards civilisation in future so that till the German race remained, India was to be a slave country. British occupation has, however, only on a reduced scale allowed the country to be industrialised and technical and scientific knowledge to be spread to Indian workers. Lately they have allowed greater opportunities to people of this country to get initiated into secrets of the latest scientific inventions, though of course with their own interest in view, by taking them in batches to England to work as "Bevin Boys" in British factories. As for the use of modern arms, the Indians learned it on the battlefields of Europe, Africa and Asia where they fight side by side with the British.

This leaves us with a good prospect for future. After this rule is over India can manage her own affairs and in no time occupy an equal place among the industrial nations of the world and become as strong politically as she was in times of Moghuls when the British sent here trade ambassadors.

It would be in that case a temporary subjection through which we had undergone as the Japanese did when Perry forced open their doors or the Germans did after Versailles leaving us all the prospects of repairing our losses and becoming strong again not for aggrandisement of other nations, as Japanese and Germans were doing but to carry forward the message of peace to the world.

And what would Germans do if they had their way? They would not impose on you a Versailles, but a Bucharest or Brest Litvsk, subjecting you to all the humiliations to which Roumanians and Russians were put during the German *Drang nach Osten* towards the end of last war. They would destroy all the prospects of any industrial and political rehabilitation that you may have. They would take all your plants under German management ruining both the capitalist and the worker and they would bring their own skilled workers from European territories while the Indian workers would have to do the unskilled work, building roads and digging trenches for their masters or graves for themselves to be shot down by a firing squad at the slightest displeasure of the Nazis who would then fill with your bodies.

As for the skilled workers at present in the country, or capitalists interested in such enterprises they would be a hindrance in way of the German rule just as those with European education would be. They could not be allowed to spread their ideas among the other people and should therefore expect either forced work in Germany at starvation wages in some Ghetto factories or else extermination as Germans are carrying on in Czechoslovakia, France, etc.

European civilisation and technical progress can in only one way remain the exclusive heritage of the nordic German race and that is by denial of progress in India and elsewhere for thousands of years to come and cold blooded murder of those who stand in the way of loot of our manpower and factories. Raids of Mahmud Ghaznavi on Som Nath would be compared with German pillage of Indian industrial plants seem merely a Nazi street raid on the head quarters of the Communists in Berlin before the revolution.

To judge what will be the lot of India industrially, you have only to look at France, Belgium or Czechoslovakia to-day for whom no such plan of denial of technical progress exists, (at least not in case of Belgians and the Frenchmen though in that of the Czechs, the Germans may have in keeping with their view of the slave race, forbidden any extension of such knowledge among the Czechs).

The industrial wealth of those countries is drained away to Germany, plants are dismantled, so that it will take tens of years in case of these countries to return to the pre-war level of prosperity and industrial progress (It took Germany after the last war when her industrial plants were untouched twelve years to shake off the effects of disorganisation of industries consequent on defeat and six years more of day and night work on Nazi four year plans before she was able to raise her head high among industrial nations, and then spread her trade to Balkans etc) In case of India it should be tens of hundred years before she can come to her present level of industrial progress. The Nazi beast is capable of undoing in a few years what it has taken us two centuries to build up in face of obstacles set in our way by the British vested interests and that section of people whose outlook on Indian affairs is distinctly conservative.

Number three, the privilege of German citizenship has been dealt with in the next chapter. Here we will only say that Germans consider all those not born in Germany and of German Aryan blood, not citizens of their land, but as aliens. Those of German dominions must therefore be treated as aliens in Germany and in their own land denied the privileges which Germans reserve for their citizens in matters of education, housing, state protection, etc. The natives cannot

claim such facilities as the German citizen has, for how can the non-Aryans be equal to the Aryans? From the nations having their own political order is meant a system subsequent to Germany, in which citizenship could not be interpreted as it would be in case of a German in Germany. The native political order would be different from the German in the sense its population would not enjoy rights as Germans do. They could not be allowed to sit in Parliament as French allowed the negroes before the war or to appeal to German supreme courts, (which would not make much difference as both the German courts as well as parliament or Nazi ridden are run by those men with leanings towards them) as the British permits the citizens of their empire to do. If a native were assaulted by a German the latter could not be tried by a native court but by a German which would take the same view of such crimes which it had done in case of Jew-baiting. On the other hand a native supposing he visits Germany and he is murdered there in a brawl by some Germans would die a dog's death, without any retribution to the criminal. The native government would not be competent to try him and the German courts would not bother about an alien citizen and could not interfere in it. Thus the German law of denying citizenship to natives encourages lynchings as it was done in America, and in relation to other countries denies protection to natives as the British offer to an Indian citizen travelling abroad. If a native were in trouble in a foreign country, the voice of the native government could scarcely be heard by the stronger foreign government and the German government could not intervene to protect those who were not its citizens. The native in German empire would be like concubine of a Muslim chief treated as a wife without enjoying the legal status of it and likely to

be thrown overboard at any time it pleased the German master.

In (4) intermarriage between Germans and natives is forbidden. It would pollute the pure Aryan blood. Those who have already married German girls would be immediately divorced from them as the Jews were in Germany from their German wives. This denies to the coloured people the right they enjoy at present when marriages between Europeans and them are not objected to. What is true of marriage is also true of love and all promiscuous relations. A native found sleeping with a German girl may be lynched, as Jews were in Germany or his face besmeared with tar and made to walk the streets with a placard sticking on his back. "This swine polluted a German Aryan girl."

Some of the Indians of the younger generation display a distinct tendency to break the conventions and marry English women. German would stand to no such nonsense.

The fifth is a clever German attempt to back up the reactionary forces in the countries which they occupy and encourage spirit of national revival of putrid and age old system thus giving rise to nationalism on Nazi model but without the cultural advantages enjoyed by the Nazis. They have thus striped Roumania, Hungary and Finland of their national and industrial wealth incapacitating them for decades to come, but have given to them fanatical attachment towards their culture, because in this way when it serves their purpose, they can create divisions among these states. Why should the Germans take trouble to educate the natives in their own culture when they would dismantle all their industry, take it home, drain their man power and deny them technical skill?

<sup>1</sup>What is the use of the old culture if we cannot blend it into new and achieve economic and political advancement? What can knowledge of our past greatness mean, if we cannot create that now? The sight of financially industrially and intellectually backward people reviving the old culture is comical like that of a man who sees aeroplanes in the sky for the first time and imagines that he could pilot the plane if he were allowed to ride it

It is doubtful if the Germans can ever allow the Roumanians or Hungarians to revive their old culture. In case of the citizens of the empire which the Germans wished to build up, this is even less true. Not all can be allowed like Roumanians to go far in will o the wisp idea of their own civilisation. For them this revival does not mean digging trenches in foreign lands to spread ideas of their "civilisation" (The Nazis favour us with this word after continuously reviling us as uncivilised and conceiving plans of stripping us of all necessities of civilised life. How generous of them to call our past heritage 'civilisation') It would remain limited to digging old caves in their territory and finding out remnants of culture in 2000 B C and consoling themselves with Sanskrit Arabic and Persian books while they dig gold mines, build tractors tanks, aeroengines, cars with their men and material

No the Nazi encouragement of native culture would never go so far as it has in Roumania Hungary etc. They are their allies. The natives would be slaves like the Czechs and Poles, even worse. Their attention would be directed towards their own culture in order to strengthen the hands of that band of orthodoxy but utterly useless people who believe that salvation for their country lies in returning to simple village life of old days, wearing Khaddar and

sprouting Kalidas or Sadi without trying to raise the level of civilisation in India as high as it was then by imbibing not only native culture but also foreign. The Nazis want to create a class here of stern enemies of progress, a band of utterly unrealistic, but fanatical "our own culture first" people who could be then set against those who want progress economic as well as political. They want to feed us on dreams and national myths, and canalise our energy in building up their empire still further. There can always be found men in all countries not so much advanced in science, who can be tempted to believe in their own past, to the exclusion of future and made to live in it. The chaos resultant in our economic life as a result of persistence of capitalist economy, have created a class of people among educated as well as uneducated who have lost faith in progress, science and technical advance and are utterly frustrated and dejected. This class is the legacy of capitalism and British rule. India can absorb its energies in useful channels after getting freedom. As for the Nazis, they would use it as a class of counter-revolutionaries against those who want a free India. Of all people among us they are most amenable to Nazi influence.

The sixth, is purposely vague, about "natives having a voice in courts which will be administered by Germans". What sort of voice can these natives have in courts run on Nazi model? How much voice the average German has in courts of Germany which are filled with those favourably inclined towards regime. The way Nazi courts are functioning in occupied countries of Europe is obvious enough. Hedyrich was the supreme court for Czechoslovakia and "smaller" judges consisted of Gestapo officials. Himmler is the same in Poland, Seydewitz in Belgium and Holland, Von Runstedt in France. Some

such supreme courts could be established in the Nazi overseas empire also and staff of S. A. and S. S. could follow to take over duties of minor judges. The Germans have made no such "mistakes" about trusting the natives which the British have. It would be observed that throughout this empire plan the Nazis have one after another reversed all that policy, which has been pursued by Britain these 150 years. The British allowed Indians to be judges even of Federal Court in India. Such a thing is unthinkable with Nazis strident over Asiatic continent.

It is, however, no justification of the British policy in India, for unlike the Nazis the British are fighting for democracy and the absence of a representative government in India provides a glaring contrast to the slogans of global freedom raised in America.

Justice administered will be swift, say the Nazis. It would be swift as much as it was in Germany on the communists and social Democrats. The way Gregor Strasser, Von Schleicher, Röhm and Karl Ernst met their death is the Nazi pattern of swift justice. The only trial in Germany held after 1932 in which some semblance of civilised methods of justice was maintained due to the indomitable will of the chief actor in that drama; Dimitroff, was the Reichstag fire trial. It was given a vast publicity and Nazi methods of torturing witnesses were exposed with the result that the Nazis had to acquit the accused and make it a note that in future they would never follow such methods of trial. Instead they instituted the swift justice method, which meant secret trial by Nazi officials and immediate punishment to those who fell in their hands. In the Nazi empire,

justice should be much more swift than that, for the right of the German citizens are not the rights of the natives. The Nazi philosophy denies German citizenship to other peoples, so the judges in empire would be much less scrupulous about life of the people than those in Germany were and are.

Finally, the functioning of chieftains as judges under Nazi control is a crude example of the custom of "Jirga" prevailing at present in certain areas of India. The Nazi liking for this kind of judicial system is a striking example of their tribal instincts. In spite of all their technical progress they have the streak of the primitive Teuton Knights whose political philosophy of force they have adopted as their own. The leader-principal prevailing among the tribes forms the main plank of the Nazi movement. Just as among Nazis the word of the *gruppenfuhrer* and *obergruppenfuhrer* is considered to be final, so the command of the tribal leader is obeyed in the Jirga. The reason for maintaining this class of tribal chiefs is the Nazi desire to keep on the one hand the primitive spirit alive in the occupied empire and on the other to have such a group of men to rely upon for building up of their strength. They would rather trust the tribal chiefs, or where they do not exist reactionaries and orthodox people to form the judiciary rather than the intelligensia. The love for "courts administered by chieftains under Nazi control" is on par with their concern for the native civilisation in which they wish to educate the people. The Nazis can despise the intelligensia as "jabbering orientals" but they can have no objection to hobnobbing with men of tribal instincts who would back up any 'system' of government so long as they remain on the top.

The seventh is meaningless, for according to the Nazi philosophy very little industry will be left to function in these areas. The question of individual industries being subordinated to the interests of the colony does not arise as the interests of German industry at home are to be the first and foremost consideration. This false attempt at appeasing the working class, by telling them that industry would be run according to the interests of the people would not simply wash, as the Nazi view of Native workers is that they must be for ever kept in a degraded state. Similarly the capitalist who reads in these lines a Nazi attempt at a greater alliance with his class as in Germany, in interests of efficiency, should also be disappointed, as they have no soft corner in their heart for the native capitalists. They would expropriate them in interests of German industry and not form alliances as they have done in Germany.

The eighth can hardly be believed in view of the Nazi interference in religions in Germany. There they have persecuted both the Catholic and the Protestant church for not blindly following the party lines. Many of the clergy who defied Hitler were thrown into concentration camps including Paster Nienioiler the arch-enemy of Hitler among the Bishops who was many times released and re arrested. The Nazi relations with Vatican remain strained due to treatment of Catholics in Germany, Poland and Belgium. The Vatican Radio from the very beginning of war carried on a campaign against Nazi treatment of the Poles. Hitler's relations with Pope worsened much earlier than that. It was when Nazi infiltration began in Austria where a clerical fascist regime was in power that Pope

grew angry. Later on the murder of Dollfuss, and arrest of Schuschnigg together with the rape of Austria made the gulf between the two wider still.

The Nazi philosophy of state clashes with 'all religions. They have created a religion of their own, out of the idea of Shintoism, the gospel of force of the Teuton Knights and racial theories of Hitler. This religion aims at domination of Aryan race of Germany. Hitler put his views on religion in nutshell when he said in 1923 "We do not want to have any other God—Only Germany." Again his views about Christ mentioned, by Kurt G. W. Ludleke in his book "I know Hitler" are worthy of note:— "Jesus Christus" he (Hitler) said, thoughtfully in a quieter almost solemn voice. "It is the tragedy of the Germanic world that no German Helland was born among us: that our organic spiritual evolution was suddenly violently interrupted; that Jesus was judaized, distorted, falsified and an alien Asiatic spirit was forced upon us. That is a crime we must repair". Such is Hitler's view about Christ who is considered by millions of Europeans as their saviour. He considers Christianity it a judaized Asiatic spirit forced upon them, and wants a Germanic God and a Christ of the same race as of a nordic German blood. When he flings away a religion cherished dear by millions of his compatriots, merely because it is Asiatic—what sort of attitude would he adopt about Asiatic people following Asiatic religions instead of that of the Teuton Knights of centuries ago? He can have very little patience with Islam, Hindulism, Buddhism etc. It is not to say that no man has the right to differ from Asiatic religions and air his own views. Hitler has every right to say about religion what he wants to say. We have so many religions here and such a

great hold of the priests over people that one should like to see it broken not suddenly by force but by education of the people and spread of scientific knowledge

That is not what Hitler aims at His hatred against religions is not inspired by any scientific knowledge, and it is not expressed in a way calculated to disarm the suspicions of the religious minded It is racial hatred against Asiatic religions as opposed to the German one of race worship and it expresses a brutal desire to suppress religions of other people by force

Hitler will not exercise any tolerance towards Hinduism, Islam or Buddhism or Christianity or wait for spread of scientific ideas among the people till they gradually themselves give up religious beliefs He does not want any permeation of scientific knowledge among natives Did he not say that they were not to be educated according to European methods of education ?

He will instead ram down the threats of the natives, the superiority of Germanic religion to all other religions of the world They will be allowed to practice their own religious beliefs only if they admit the rights of the Germanic religion, which means servility of theirs to the German race so long as they live. They will have to expunge out of their religions all talks about equality, justice, meekness, humility Independence of spirit, the right of the people to have a say in administration, etc , and instead accept religions based on glorification of force, cruelty, injustice, and intolerance Religion must become synonymous with militarism

Hitler who said earlier that there was only one God and that was Germany, later on realised that

since most people in Germany believed in God it was best to use that word in his speeches when what he meant to say was German Aryan race. So speaking at Nuremburg at a National Socialist Women's rally in 1936, he said, "I believe in providence and I believe providence to be just, therefore, I believe that providence always rewards the strong and the industrious and the upright."

The Nazis were "strong," "industrious" and "upright;" their reward was to subdue the weak, the peace loving and thus the erring nations and tell them after giving them a hard one on the jaw which should send them reeling that God is on the side of the strong, and they must pay homage to the God of force and adopt it as their religion.

Little has to be said about the ninth point of Nazi blue book of Empire building, which lays down that there would be no economic exploitation of the natives. After all that had been said by Hitler in "Meinkampf" and in Dusseldorf speech, only the Nazi, who are "strong and upright" can have the courage to make such a bold statement, aimed at concealing their ghoulish aims.

Any man reading the eight points carefully, would be able to laugh at the ninth which is aimed at deceiving the people. After saying that they are to be denied European education, technical skill, their standard of living kept low and they were to be used as slave labourers to maintain white domination, what else is left in way of economic exploitation? Perhaps their lives are left, and Nazis are telling them that these are spared to them. The latest method and so for the lowest, of exploitation of theirs is

that which is being practised in Poland against Jews, who are being indiscriminately shot. Only those are spared who are able to give large sums to the Nazi police. That is presumably the economic 'exploitation' which they have not mentioned against the Indians. They had reason to spare them their lives. They had many enemies in Europe--with whom they had to deal with--and who were yet at peace with them.

## CHAPTER IV

### INDIANS AND GERMAN CITIZENSHIP.

The plan to deny right of German citizenship to the "natives" was actuated ' by Hitler's indignant remark in the only book that he ever wrote that "You cannot make a German citizen out of an Indian or a Chinese". He had seen the Weimar republic tolerant towards the Indians and the Chinese and in case of some even permitting them to be German citizens. Some of our luckless *émigré* who stayed out of Germany after Hitler's coming to power found in those days Germany as the only refuge. They were denied asylum in every other country of Europe and were in this respect much more miserable than those anti-Fascist exiles who have left Germany. Some relief at least has been forthcoming to the latter while in case of Jews, well to do men of their own religion look to their comforts. In case of the Indians and the Chinese there was no such comfort in that Europe which had been only recently freed from the shackles of Hohenzollern, Habsburg and Rumanoff Imperialisms. Only Germany offered the respite from endless trudging across various countries of Europe. But that Austrian *émigré* in Germany, the ex painter who was starving and was lucky to get enlisted in army and thereafter accepted as a citizen of the Reich by the tolerant Weimar republic, was not only impatient of orientals in those days and called them "mountbanks of Asia" and "jabbering orientals", trying to block their

sympathy for the cause of India—Hitler had done all that and he was now indulging in another campaign of calumny, which was aimed at depriving them of German citizenship and treating of those who came to that country after that as aliens.

It was lucky that no body then paid any particular attention to his haraunges and they were treated like his other outbursts against Asiatics and contemptuously ignored. But all the same it was a very bold campaign which he had launched. One may ask what right had he to demand their being treated as aliens when he was himself an Austrian. If only the German republic had refused to accept him as a German citizen, all this trouble to the world and to Germany could have been checked. Hitler sent back into Austria would have meant end of National socialism in Germany and he would have not made much headway in Austria as that psychological atmosphere was lacking in that country. Hitler had always held the Habsburg empire in contempt, and though an Austrian he looked wistfully across the borders into Germany and longed to be there. Germany was an ideal to him. He loved it with all the zeal and fanaticism of a convert. But his love was based on glorification of militarism. Suppose his dreams had been cut short then. It would have been a fitting reply to his political diatribes against the parties of the Left and the racial calumny that he was raising, just then against the Jews and Asiatics.

And if it was difficult to make a German out of an Indian or Chinese; it was true in case of the Austrian too. It is likely that he never viewed German politics from the point of view of men of

that country but as an Austrian and as a Foreigner and kept in view what was according to him the best thing in the interest of Austria, and not of Germany. For instance the very idea of loss of territories originated with the Austrian Imperialists rather than the German republicans. This 'loss of face of Germany business' was in Hitler's hands exaggerated beyond all proportions. Germany had as a matter of fact not lost much face. No territories of its in Europe were occupied and though reparations and unilateral disarmament of Germany was undesirable and contributed to misery there, the republic given time and a changed attitude towards the parties of the left could peacefully settle with the victor countries. Instead Hitler, the Austrian, the man whose philosophy was foreign to the entire spirit prevailing then in Germany, exaggerated the defects of the Versailles Treaty and attached very great importance to reuniting Germans in Europe with the Motherland. How could these men be torn away from the territories which they had adopted as their motherland and whose frontiers would be thus thrown into endless confusion if they were to join Germany and make it strongest in Europe? This is an utterly fantastic idea. There are millions of Germans in Russia and America. Would Hitler like to extend Germanic state to those countries for this reason? Obviously he is trying to do that today. And yet why did he feel so passionately for unity of those Germans with Germany? No sooner had he been relieved from duties in the western front—this Austrian mountbank—how did it happen that such a love for Germans seized him? The answer to it is that as an Austrian conservative if not a true follower of Hapsburgs his heart had been lacerated

by the state of affairs prevailing in the south eastern European territories of Hansburgs, where a conglomeration of races existed and defied unity with Austria. The Austrian wanted it to be one empire instead it consisted of several small kingdoms each pulling different ways. It was this decadence of Austria about which Hitler had waxed eloquent in "Meinkampf." Having not been able to resolve such muddle in Austria where it existed, he was obsessed with the thought of removing it in Germany, where it did not exist. The Germans in south Tyrol, Sudetenland, Poland and Austria were all contented people till Hitler started his typical Austrian (and thus foreign to *Deutschtums* or German spirit) haraunges about divided Germans. Thus began the rise of Nazis in Germany and permeation of a philosophy which had nothing to do with conditions prevalent in Germany at that time.

Obviously then the harm done to Germany and the German cause by this Austrian with ideas of typically conservative and imperialist men of that country was immense, whereas no such influence was wielded on German policy by the Indians and the Chinese. The Asiatics were in those twenties when Hitler began his campaign against leniency of German republic towards them, few in numbers in Germany. In subsequent years their number did not increase as it did in case of the Nazi party. Those who came and settled in Germany could be counted on fingers.

Before Indian *émigré* entered Germany, the November republic had come into being and sympathies with Asiatic and other oppressed people were born out of the ideas of this revolution. The few Indians abroad did not influence the tide of German revolu-

tion. They were not responsible for introduction of the democratic ideas, which actuated the attitude of German leaders towards India. As for those students who were present in Kaiser's Germany and stayed after the revolution, none of them became prominent in the new German revolution as for instance M. N. Roy the renegade did in Russia.

Hitler's view about influence of Indians on the republican leaders were considerably exaggerated. It is doubtful if Ebert, Scheidemann, Rathenau ever read Gandhi or Tilak or were influenced by such people in their attitude towards India.

Sympathy with India in the new republic was spontaneous rather than engineered. The Indians were content to have as much sympathy as they could for their cause. They did not howl in streets for it as the Austrian leader Hitler was doing in Germany.

Germany gave them protection and they used it well in imbibing German Kultur and then on return home (those who came back) spreading it among people, the kultur of Goethe, Heine, Marx, Hegel, Kant, Schiller and not of Bismarck and Frederick the Great, though they read them all. Quite the reverse was the use which this Austrian *émigré* who was down and out like some of them, made of German citizenship. He imbued the entire German youth with a typically Austrian imperialist outlook, which was the cause of ruin of Germany. Having taken advantage of that citizenship in such a vulgar and it seems utterly criminal way, he began hitting hard at those who had like him found refuge in Germany, but who were loyally fulfilling the conditions of German citizenship or (if they were not

naturalised which was true in most cases) never abusing the privilege of *protektion* which they enjoyed

It was easy to make a German out of these Indians than it was out of that Austrian Imperialist who was trying to create bad blood between Indians and Germans. It all depends on what you understand by that word German and Germanic spirit (*Deutschtums*). If one were to put the Hillelites and utterly senseless interpretation on the word, then Goethe, Schiller, Heines and Kant were not Germans. They never glorified the primitive Prussian spirit of Militarism. In that sense the entire Weimar republic and the parties functioning in it except the Nazis were un-German and so the Indians emigré or intellectuals living there could also be called disloyal to the German spirit and the country that gave them *protektion*.

But they were not. They were good Indians and the few who had adopted Germany as their country were good Germans as the Germans whose ancestors went centuries ago to America are Americans today.

But it seems what Hitler fretted about was not as much their influence on the German republicans (as he imagined it) and their presence in Germany because they were Indians and thus racially "inferior" to him according to his own theories—though all this had considerably influenced his anti-Indian activities—there was however, something more than that which made him restless and that was the new spirit of freedom which the Indians represented and which was the spirit that was abroad in Germany and conflicted with the Nazi philosophy.

Hitler then, was against Indians because they believed in freedom, in the German, and the Russian

conception of it and because majority of Germans believe in that He did not want to see those Indians in Germany as residents or citizens, because he did not want to see there present anybody who had the temerity to differ from him

His concept of citizenship struck at the very roots of the word freedom He who loved that and did not fall in line with the Nazis was not a German citizen He could not be that

Thence began the utterly fantastic campaign against German Jews, who were much more numerous than the Indians or the Chinese—that they had influenced the course of history in Germany in their own interests The clever Austrian Imperialist by a trick having become German which he could not be if others had taken as much narrow view of citizenship as he did, felt that the only way of his survival was to see to it that the idea of freedom was uprooted entirely from the German soil and with it those who were in favour of it

This included a considerable part of Jews, Indians, Chinese but and there was the rub, it also included millions of Germans who had to be deprived of German citizenship if Hitler's dreams were to be fulfilled Hitler planned his ideal German state He said that there could be only three kind of people living in Germany —

- (1) State citizens
- (2) State subjects and
- (3) Foreigners

State citizens were to be those of pure German nor dic blood born in Germany, State subjects were all those of other blood born in Germany, like the Jews etc who could live there but could not have the rights of the citizens and the third were foreigners which

meant all those who had come into Germany from other countries and were living there. They could live in Germany only as guests and were subject to the alien laws.

Hitler had in those days dismissed the German Aryans, hostile to his ideas, with the thought that he would win them over and those who did not accept Nazism could be bludgeoned into doing so. So he had made no separate provision against them. It could have cut the very ground under his feet if he had thus discriminated against the Germans also. The whole concept of German citizenship which he had built on racial ideas would have collapsed and he could no longer incite the Germans against non-Aryans of German birth or of Foreign countries. So then he remained discreetly silent about the subject of citizenship for millions of Germans sworn to end his power in Germany. He wanted his theory to be given a racial appearance. It would in that case be easy to kick out the Jews, the Indians or the Chinese or anybody else he thought had betrayed the German militarist spirit.

As a matter of fact his ideas about citizenship were as much based on political ground as on racial mythology.

It would be a sad mistake to assume that only racial feelings inspired him. Indians imagining the existence of racial feeling in Weimer republic are apt to take it that anti-Indian drive had the backing of all the Germans then. It had not. It never found favour with many of those Nordic Germans who did not see eye to eye with Hitler in political matters.

We are in danger of isolating ourselves from that common struggle which was then going on in Germany

against Hitlerite Imperialist ideas Indians were the common victims of the Nazis They were ranged on the side of Social Democrats, Jews, Communists, Liberals and all those who were opposed to Hitler The campaign against Indians swelled with campaign against the other enemies of Hitler

It was not by any accident that Hitler in 1932 had in his speeches remembered Indians, attacked them ferociously, praised British methods of rule and outlined his own if it ever came to that He had India in his mind all these thirteen years from the day this Austrian down and out found security and comfort in Germany, which country he was to lay waste In fighting the free Germans and Jews he had been fighting us And now that fight had reached its climax, his anti Indian views, as we find in his Dusseldorff speech also reached the feverish pitch

That year saw many of those men who had dedicated their lives to Germany who were of Nordic Aryan blood leave that country when the Coventry revolution was surging forwards men of other nationalities who had made common cause with them also left Hitler was triumphantly sweeping his way to power

Indians who had found protection in Germany, left that country only stray students here and there remaining in the new Germany

Jews had fled Chinese were by this time in China fighting either for Chiang Kai Shek or for the Reds The German Social Democrat and Red leaders had gone

But many were left behind Many Jews were still German citizens, many Nordic Germans stayed in Germany The free German spirit was still abroad It too had to be liquidated And lest those

who had gone abroad to find their way back in Germany the Nazi theory of German citizenship become law.

Those living in Germany were divided into three parts. The process of *Gleichschaltung* of non-Nazis began. Evidently this was not successful. Millions of German workers and Social Democrats of Nordic blood enjoyed German citizenship, and yet these men, were not loyal followers of the Nazi party, believed that they were oppressed and had a common cause with other oppressed, such as Indians. This was monstrous and intolerable to the Nazis especially as the alliance with British and the French Conservatives was very well on the way. The Nazis had built up a new order in Germany and these men were still there like some old creditor who had come back to gather his old debts.

They reminded this miserable outcast Austrian now the *Reichskanzler* of his early struggle with those people who had sought *protektion* of the Reich. If the German "citizenship" remained in such a state of confusion, and Nordic Germans refused to be good Nazis, it may lead to the old state of affairs, when German citizenship was an easy matter for an Indian, Chinese or an Austrian. So in 1935, Hitler through Frick the minister of interior sought to amend the laws of the Reich in practice considerably tampered with since the Nazi revolution of 1933. The new law as revealed by Frick on May 3, 1935 gave full German citizenship to only those who had taken an oath of loyalty to Hitler as head of the state. German subjects even if born in Germany of 100% Aryan parentage on both sides would cease to enjoy the

privileges (which included military services and voting, though not the duties such as tax paying) of citizenship. Jews would be excluded from German citizenship when the law was promulgated since only those who were racially German or Aryan could be German citizens. Jews were not to be required to serve in the German army under the conscription law on that ground. People living in German frontiers were placed in three categories according to the principles which were laid in "Meinkampf". In principle it was stated that birth in Germany gave only status of a subject. A subject had not the right of citizenship. This he could obtain by a blameless record through school education, labour service and military service. Dr Frick's enunciation of this new law of citizenship was concluded by a saying from "Meinkampf" extolling the virtues of German citizenship and declaring that "It must be held in great honour to be a citizen of the Reich, even if only a crossing sweeper than to be a king in a Foreign state".

It was clear that both in case of the Germans of Nordic blood as well as the foreigners political considerations were blended with the racial mumbo jumbo, and if anything the former outweighed the latter. Hitler had begun that processes of brutally driving home to every German the plain truths of Nazism, which was to bring about a majority of those people behind him and thus give rise to that fantastic Vansittart view be that all Germans were guilty and Prussianism was deeply inculcated in them. This should prove conclusively that upto May 1933 Hitler had not been able to bring about the desired Nazi fication of Germany and dissident Germans were threatened with depriving of German citizenship if

they refused to be loyal to Hitler or were found indulging in any anti-Nazi activities. However this is not all. Till 1936 *Manchester Guardian* report about executions of men of Nordic blood charged with Communist or Social Democratic activities, who were considered subversive to the safety of Nazi regime.

In view of all this to accept Vanistartism to do is to deny all faith in that progress for which we are fighting and for which Germans openly revolted upto 1936 and thereafter secretly and less outspokenly.

So far as India is concerned we share with the Nordic Germans deprived of their citizenship in 1933 a common misfortune, for Dr Frick's law based on "Meinkampf" and subsequent experiences of the Austrian encounter with his political opponents clearly castigated Indians and led to their expulsion from Germany along with the Chinese, the Jews, the Social Democrats and the Communists. None of those emigrants who had been in Berlin in twenties could now re-enter Germany or even dream of owing allegiance to Adolf Hitler. They could not be state subjects even if the came—they could be only guests—and that unwanted ones in Hitler's Germany, subject to all the laws of the aliens.

Dr Frick gave us very little reason for either any changed view about the Nazi regime (which was impossible even if he had been favourably disposed towards the Indians) or going to the other extreme and blaming the entire German people for anti Indian legislation. One could see a small minority of German torch-bearer of the *kultur* of Goethe and Heine, Marx and Schiller, Beethoven and Bach dwindling no doubt in numbers but still resolutely battling its way for-

ward against the Nazi hordes While they perished thus, defying efforts at *Gleichschaltung* how could we take a purely racial view of Frick's laws and believe that Nazis were discriminating against Indians, as coloured people only and not as a part of a political vendetta against all those who believed in freedom The law of 1935 of German citizenship should be understood as an attempt at stone welling of revolution inside Germany and its becoming of that country as in the twenties and home for all the freedom loving people Hitler himself a revolutionary who had entered Germany due to this "open door" policy of the republic towards the Foreigners now wished to close the door for ever so that it should not become home of German revolutionaries who have fled abroad ;

Every day he was growing a despot and feared that somebody from Left may not someday stage a beer celler putsch as he did in 1933 Read in its international context it was an attempt at allaying the fears of the vested interests in England, America, France, who wanted a proof positive that Hitler had for ever made rise of Bolshevism impossible in Germany and they were to be rid of fear that had been haunting them since 1917, that one day Bolshevism would sweep its way to central and western Europe and joining hands with Germany make a united assault on the fortresses of capitalism There they had accepted Germany back in the international family of nations and Hitler as its accredited representative inspite of the fact that his hands were soiled with the blood of millions of freedom loving Germans They had shown as little emotion in it as the United States has in accepting new governments in South America whenever it suited its interests

One of those powers, England was to sign in that year an Anglo-German Naval Pact with Germany which gave an opportunity to the latter country to revive her navy on increased scale. The old German gods of warfare Scharnhorst and Scheer were to be revived to life, thanks to Britain, and on their altar were to be sacrificed Nordic Germans who were denied German citizenship for differing with Hitler, and thus made to live a life of misery and poverty without any civic rights, and those Communists and Social Democrats who were guilty of plotting against the Nazi state by forming trade unions were to be shot. The British had not only an interest in Frick's law because it was to nip in the bud all Bolshevik intrigues in Germany but also it was an assurance (from "a gentleman" as Mr. Chamberlain might have said) that so far as the Indians were concerned Berlin was as far away and as difficult to live in as the moon. Hitler had told them about presence of such "jabbering orientals" in Germany after the war and how they hobnobbed with Republicans while he screamed anathemas against them. They had in the typical British Tory way accepted this danger to be as acute as Hitler said the Bolshevik menace in Germany was. So they were not prepared to see such a spectacle again in Germany. They had always declared that they would not interfere in internal affairs of Germany and though some anti-fascist had taken refuge in England, they had no sympathy with them. They had given Hitler a free hand in Germany. Could he not assure them that he would do the same about British empire and kick out bag and baggage and "jabbering orientals" that made their appearance in Germany. That Ribbentrop could assure them that it would happen as they desired. "For that we have passed Frick's law,

Rest assured and sign Anglo-Germany treaty of Naval Limitation," he might have said. They signed it. The law had no doubt been passed in Germany and it has been applied with Nazi ruthlessness. That was true enough. But as for interference in British empire—it was one of Tory delusions. Ribbontrop never kept his promise.

## CHAPTER V

### THE WHEEL COMES A FULL CIRCLE

When a frenzied maniac passes a law which is to deprive millions of people of citizenship of a country which he has adopted as his own, and which has the misfortune to pass under his control, and tries thus to render not only the miserable but forgetting his own vagrant days of early life, when he sought refuge in that country, bars the doors to man of other races, who had spent considerable part of life there—when a despot reaches out for such fast measures, then a climax must reach and either those who have been living in far off lands—and it seems much more comfortably than Germans, Asiatics or Jews effected by Frick's laws ever could—and goading the frenzied maniac on to action, either they must help him to realise his aims or he would turn against them also

If he could turn against Nordic German and lift his hand to strike them he could turn against everybody. If he could after fifteen years of reviling Indians and other Asiatics and praising Britain and its empire building methods, be no where nearer the desired goal of that empire—there were only two ways open to him, either to throw up the sponge and let somebody else—Democrat rule in Germany—or get what he wanted even if it meant turning against those whom he had praised, and praising those whom he had reviled. He chose the latter course. It was the easiest though most dishonest.

We have seen how gradually the rifts became evident in 100% white bloc which Hitler sought to build at Dusseldorff against the Bolsheviks, the Indians and the other coloured people, whose lands were to be carved up. There were rifts not in the sense that Germany had openly turned against Britain or France, but because slowly, irresistably, she had begun to plan about her empire, not in consultation with Downing Street or Qudry Dorsay, but on her own initiative and hint broad outlines of what she wished to do when she got it.

From Dusseldorff to March 1939 when the Germans published their "blue book" of Nazi empire building is a long way off. In between these years Nazi had learned not only to say that the destiny of the white people was to rule the coloured but also what the destiny of the German Aryan race was. This impatience to get empire had as good old Marx pointed out led to inevitable clash between the interests of the white countries of West and Germany. If Germany was to expand, Britain or France or both must stop her. It could not last for long—this house that Hitler planned at Dusseldorff and which was built on the ruins of the old Reichstage in 1933, in the blood stained land where lay thousands of dead bodies of Social Democrats, Communists and Liberals of Germany.

Negatively this 100 % white bloc was all very well—that is so far as Nazis conduct with Bolsheviks, Social Democrats and Indians were concerned, they could go hand in glove with western countries.

So long as they could cement their friendship on mere hostility against certain people whom they despised—this friendship could last first but you cannot build up friendship merely on determination to hate.

some people, without pausing to think how much you love each other and trying to remove each others suspicions.

The "Front populaire" in France and Spain collapsed because no such love existed between various parties which could sustain the alliance if for some reason or other the enthusiasm of hating the common enemy tapered off and one of them found something to like in him. The western white bloc was destined to collapse similarly. Hysteric outbursts against common enemy, did not keep these countries together. After burning the finest parliament in Europe, murdering thousands of Communists and Democrats, abusing Indians and barring doors of Germany to them and other people who had gone into exile the Nazis had not built any empire for themselves. They had merely proved their ruthlessness and brutality—qualities essential for empire building—but not constituting the whole sadistic philosophy underlying that ambition—only part of it—the other was cunningness and deceit

Nazis got hold of these weapons. They sought to appease both the Bolsheviks and the Indians. The Bolsheviks in summer of 1939, Indians much earlier.

The facade unity with Britain and France was Maintained outwardly upto 1938, in interests of Nazi plans of empire, and anti-Bolshevik crusade

This truth which had made them uneasy all along forced itself on them in 1935, when they wished to build a Navy and the British came forward to negotiate about its limitation in interest of both countries. Britain unwilling to repeat the mistake of its liberal governments before the war was taking no chances about German fleet. It knew that increased fleet in that

We have seen how gradually the rifts became evident in 100% white bloc which Hitler sought to build at Dusseldorff against the Bolsheviks, the Indians and the other coloured people, whose lands were to be carved up. There were rifts not in the sense that Germany had openly turned against Britain or France, but because slowly, irresistably, she had begun to plan about her empire, not in consultation with Downing Street or Qudy D'orsay, but on her own initiative and hint broad outlines of what she wished to do when she got it.

From Dusseldorff to March 1939 when the Germans published their "blue book" of Nazi empire building is a long way off. In between these years Nazi had learned not only to say that the destiny of the white people was to rule the coloured but also what the destiny of the German Aryan race was. This impatience to get empire, had as good old Marx pointed out led to inevitable clash between the interests of the white countries of West and Germany. If Germany was to expand, Britain or France or both must stop her. It could not last for long—this house that Hitler planned at Dusseldorff and which was built on the ruins of the old Reichstage in 1933, in the blood stained land where lay thousands of dead bodies of Social Democrats, Communists and Liberals of Germany.

Negatively this 100 % white bloc was all very well—that is so far as Nazis conduct with Bolsheviks Social Democrats and Indians were concerned, they *could go hand in glove with western countries*

So long as they could cement their friendship on mere hostility against certain people whom they despised—this friendship could last first but you cannot build up friendship merely on determination to hate

some people, without pausing to think how much you love each other and trying to remove each others suspicions.

The "Front populaire" in France and Spain collapsed because no such love existed between various parties which could sustain the alliance if for some reason or other the enthusiasm of hating the common enemy tapered off and one of them found something to like in him. The western white bloc was destined to collapse similarly. Hysteric outbursts against common enemy, did not keep these countries together. After burning the finest parliament in Europe, murdering thousands of Communists and Democrats, abusing Indians and barring doors of Germany to them and other people who had gone into exile the Nazis had not built any empire for themselves. They had merely proved their ruthlessness and brutality—qualities essential for empire building—but not constituting the whole sadistic philosophy underlying that ambition—only part of it—the other was cunningness and deceit

Nazis got hold of these weapons. They sought to appease both the Bolsheviks and the Indians. The Bolsheviks in summer of 1939, Indians much earlier.

The facade unity with Britain and France was Maintained outwardly upto 1938, in interests of Nazi plans of empire, and anti-Bolshevik crusade

This truth which had made them uneasy all along forced itself on them in 1935, when they wished to build a Navy and the British came forward to negotiate about its limitation in interest of both countries. Britain unwilling to repeat the mistake of its liberal governments before the war was taking no chances about German fleet. It knew that increased fleet in that

country meant a menace to that empire and opened the overseas territories to Germany. A big German navy was a challenge to the British supremacy on high seas. It was a sign that one day as in 1934, it would come into grips with her. The Germans, however, were determined to break the treaty if not approached in a friendly way, and asked to have what they wanted and leave to Britain the rest. They were in this way allowed to build a navy, whose tonnage should be 35% of that of the British navy for the entire empire. That was quite sufficient for them at present.

The French protested to the British that Germany had got too much; much more than they had. Their protests had no effect on Britain. Britain was considering her own interests first. That was the first rift in the 100 % white bloc of western countries.

The rebuilding of German navy gave that nation consciousness of being well on the way of achieving the goal of empire outlined by Hitler previously. In Britain it was the first official recognition of German aims, and first instalment of that policy of appeasement which was to encourage Germany to more such adventures. It also meant a new chapter for the latter country's foreign policy and that was of trying to show up Britain before the world and her own empire as the arch Imperialist who had grabbed all the world and who stood in path of those who wanted what they called *lebensraum* but which was in fact veiled Imperialism.

To the Germans then, although at the time they did not say so, the Naval Treaty was an example of British hypocrisy, which they had not so far seen, but which now became apparent to them because the British knowing of German intentions had

peacefully allowed them to build a Navy. They would not countenance any German claim to colonies, and yet they were allowing the Germans to build a navy.

It did not occur to Nazis what they had got out of alliance with the British conservatives. They now seemed to see what they had not got, and that was after the navy, the empire. And yet how to bring about such a 35 % (even if such division was possible) ratio with Britain abroad world territories, when they had only recently come into power? The year 1933 was spent in burning the Reich, planning to burn it, and clearing away the streets of the Nazi and anti-Nazis in grips with each other under cover of the smoke of the Parliament. 1934 was the year of stabilising the revolution among its followers by purging those Nazis who wanted Hitler to go left and fulfill past promises. Their energies were also consumed in opposition to the Austrian regime and in more struggle with the Germans who would not accept Nazis as the representatives of the true *Deutschums* or Germanic spirit.

And in 1935 they had felt somewhat at ease and were able to think about what "more" they wanted, by building up the Navy they got Britain's tacit consent of their Imperialist designs on the overseas countries. For the present it was best to be satisfied with it and keep the facade of unity of the western white nations.

In that year Italy began her adventures in Abyssinia, which were opposed by Britain and drew angry retorts from Italian press, about British Imperialism which was held up as the oppressor of the world. The Germans had a sneaking sympathy for the Italians not only because they were Fascists

and goose stepped and formed in fours like them but also because they liked their aggressive spirit Hitler's speech in early 1936 was a confirmation of the Duce's views and a pat on his back to go ahead

But Mussolini's campaign had not only made the Nazis bold enough to talk about destiny of white races to govern coloured races but also to take note of anti British campaign in Italian press and the propaganda of their radio among the Arabs of Palestine against the British This propaganda was not having much effect for the simple reason that people were convinced that though Britain had in the past expanded with similar methods, it was no justification for Mussolini to shower poison gas and bombs on Abyssinia The wanton aggression on that helpless country had sent a wave of indignation not only in coloured countries but also among the white people Only the Nazis were unmoved They as superior Aryan race gloated over the extinction of an Independent black state and slaughter or slavery of its inhabitants For the first time in European history Hitler's programme in 'Mein Kampf' and subsequently elaborated at Dusseldorf had been translated into action with modern scientific weapons which were the heritage of the 'Nordic Aryan race' and which had been used by it with Aryan ruthlessness

The Nazis also gloated over the attacks on Britain in Italian press They were convinced that if you had yourself Imperialist designs the best way was to call the other fellow imperialist and carry on with your own campaign to grab what you can Some idea of the new change that had come over the German press in regard to Britain could be had from an article published in August 1935 in the party organ 'Völkischer Beobachter' published under the guidance of Alfred Rosenberg of the 'first Nazis' and now the greatest

exponent of Aryan culture in Germany. "Völkischer Beobachter" was first acquired by the Nazis in 1919 and had since then remained under their control.

The article was an attack on Rudyard Kipling and thus on British imperialism whose exponent Kipling was. This sudden realisation that Kipling and the British were Imperialists (which they, the Nazis were not) though formerly they bragged about these common ideals of empire building of western races had come to them because Kipling had written a letter to the French novelist Henri Bordeaux, which was published in "Eclaircissement Nice". Kipling had written: "In my view future of civilisation depends on firmness of relations of our countries—the Boche has learned nothing from the last war, while he has suffered comparatively little from it".

Whereupon Prof Urbach writing in "Völkischer Beobachter" exhorted Nazis not to buy Kipling books, because he was "hater of Germany". Professor Urbach spoke with the weight of the Nazi party, whose culture leader he was, from which one may understand a sort of witch Doctor or a Pir of the trans-border areas of India, for Nazi conception of culture is hardly different from that of the primitive people. This banning of books of Literature and even burning them in some cases (Tiller, Ozzietsky, Marx and Engels, their books were publically burned in Germany) is a typical example of culture—one cannot understand why even an Imperialist should not be read by the people.

The professor goes on to say: "Both Kim and the Jungle Book" are undiluted examples of Anglo-Saxon Imperialism."

The Indian people should be much indebted to the Herr Professor that after fifteen years of continued

abuse of them as men of inferior races, and deserving to be ruled by Britain, the Nazis had now all of a sudden burst eloquent against one man who was the bard of the British empire and who had been among the foremost people of his time desiring India to remain in subjection. 'Kim' and 'Jungle Book' no doubt represented Imperialist outlook in a distinguished British Poet. India was presented to the west as a barbaric country full of snakes, beasts, fabulous treasures (while men starved, and those treasures could be seen nowhere), men with orthodox and primitive habits and altogether content with their lot under British rule. All this was true enough. Though there is no reason why Kipling's books should not be read for that reason in India, or 'Völkischer Beobachter's comment on it widely known, so that we should know that in Nazis we have to deal with a cunning and ruthless enemy.

If 'Kim' and 'Jungle Book' were really examples of Anglo-Saxon Imperialism why had professor Urbach, Dr Alfred Rosenberg and other Nazi witch doctors of Aryan culture taken so long to say it? Why did they wait for Kipling's letter in the *Nice* paper to be published to come out with an attack against him and the Imperialism he represented. It is clear that (as Mussolini's press was then proving) British Imperialism could only be called by that name if and when it struck at the vital Nazi interests, or some prominent British citizen demanded stern action against Germans. The rest of the time the British were members of that good family of western nations who were to be the allies of Germany in "a common crusade against Bolsheviks and a division of the coloured people's land, who hang them, richly deserved British domination. 'Kim' and 'Jungle Book' were examples of British Imperialism but were

these books worst than what their leader had written about us ? And did it lie in the mouth of Nazis to talk about others' Imperialism, when their own intentions were avowedly Imperialist ?

So far as India was concerned, this Kipling controversy would scarcely interest her. One could only laugh at Nazi perfidy. Frick had only two months ago rushed a law through the German Reich, which had denied an asylum to Indians in Germany along with Jews, Social Democrats and Communists.

And whatever view one may have about Kipling's faults, what he wrote to the French novelist was in substance true, though one wished instead of calling for Anglo-French alliance which smacks of Imperialism, he should have asked for an alliance of all those powers willing to keep militarism in Reich under *cordon Sanitaire*. The Prussian had no doubt learned very little from the last war though it was true of many of Kipling's compatriots too. The sufferings undergone by Germany compared to those by Italy, France and Russia (though not England and U S. A. which countries did not suffer much either) were also less. Kipling had taken a die-hard view of Nazi militarism, the opposite of which was represented by him in Britain. His contempt for the *Bouche* also assumed the entire German people as guilty. But while the Nazis could see mote in Kipling's eyes, they did not realise that they were arming in a way which showed they had forgotten the lessons of the last war and were getting ready to plunge the world in the new blood bath.

The timing of the attack with the Anglo-German naval pact which was also signed in those days makes its appearance most sinister. It shows that Nazis were capable of three treacherous acts at the same time.

One was Frick's law. The other was this piece of insolent sympathy with the victims of Anglo Saxon Imperialism and to crown it all was the Naval pact which was an act of alliance with the same Anglo-Saxon Imperialism which the Nazis reviled. If it was really Imperialism and the Nazis were the peace makers of the world, who innocent people could never think of reviling us as Kipling had, why this Naval pact? Why this pooling out of resources with Britain? Why if not the aim was empire and a German Imperialism infinitely worse than that represented by Kipling?

What the Nazis were interested in was not what "Kim" and "Jungle Book" said and what they did not. What offended them was that a British Poet had told them, the invincible people, that they had learned nothing from the war and only an Anglo-French alliance could knock sense into their heads. "The fool—as if any such alliance was possible"—the "*Völkischer Beobachter*" may have bawled out. "We have nipped that in the bud by Anglo German naval treaty, which establishes our right to be a powerful nation once again."

On the British side Kipling's advice was also ignored. In spite of what the "*Völkischer Beobachter*" said (perhaps the Downing Street or Foreign office never cared to notice it. After all were they responsible, if a fanciful pact makes an indiscretion and gets into trouble for that) the British ruling class was only too ready to forget such remarks or dismiss them with mild rebukes of an aunt, whose early love affairs some of the children hinted at and which sent a titter among all the present.

"*Völkischer Beobachter's*" remark was forgotten much as Italian press's anti-British campaign was

Kipling died soon afterwards. Abyssinnia was conquered and finished.

Having achieved the first triumph of their Imperialist policy in form of the Naval pact, the Nazis undeterred by thoughts of 35% limitation began building up the most powerful fleet in the world. So fast was their activity (it had begun much earlier only after 1934, it became much more brisk) that towards the end of 1936 they had an airforce equal to the size of that of the British Empire. This was disconcerting to the British, whose newspapers were campaigning for a western air Locarno between England, France, Germany and Italy, limiting the airforces and giving guarantee to each other against attack. The French who distrusted both the Italians and the Germans were also anxious for such a four power pact, though they were quite a good deal annoyed by Anglo-German treaty.

The ghost of the western white block was revived by hopes of an air Locarno which was from 1936 to 1938 the corner stone of British policy.

The Nazis with increasing production of airplanes and greater resources were in good bargaining position, and they kept the western countries on the tenterhooks without conceding any limitation of their own air power or imposing one on other powers. Under cover of this air-Locarno talks they begged Rhineland and Austria, and started mauling up Spain.

Indefatigable British conservatives were now wooing their Nazi prototypes into an alliance, while the latter only honoured them or at the best Hitler made a speech at the Nuremburg *Parteitag* vociferously attacking Bolshevism and making it clear, that as far as Britain and France were concerned he had no such disputes with them which could not be settled

by peace that they must all stand together and stone-wall Bolshevik advance

However that old touch was absent, that Nazis fawning on Britain and their prattling about the white bloc. There was intransigence in them which dispassionate observers could detect during their comments on Italo-Abyssinian dispute and from Berlin press version of Rudyard Kipling—but the British conservatives could not see it and so the myth of the white solidarity was maintained. In fairness to the Nazis, it may be said that if they did not actually sign air-pact with Britain, they at least refrained from annoying it or making *derisive* remarks about their Empire.

There was an understanding between both sides to keep up appearances, not about maintaining white unity of western countries but avoiding resort to war as Hitler might have said at Nuremberg.

Millions of Social Democrats, Communists and Liberals among German and several emigres from that country, German as well as Jewish, Chinese and Indians paid the price of the *kultur solidaritat* from 1932 to 1936 with their blood, loss of citizenship and wandering from country to country.

Later on when relations worsened with Britain, they were to bowl out propaganda about British methods in Palestine or India, but their utter unreliability, selfishness and Imperialism could not be kept hidden. There was no different Nazi *orientpolitik*. There was only policy of theirs—it was to keep that part of world in subjection—if now and then they attacked somebody else who was already doing that, they were doing so purely out of mischief and in order to get their own Imperialism planted on that soil.

In these circumstances the mischief of Nazi Press about Palestine and India could not be let loose in those days. They wanted a Franco victory in Spain and expansion in Europe and Britain was to be kept in good humour for that reason. Non intervention committee was the last attempt of Blimps in England and Germany to keep the illusion of unity against Democrats and Bolsheviks in Spain, Asia and Europe alive.

The Nazis having tried their steel in Spain some what successfully against the International Brigade which thoroughly licked the konder legiourhere it met them in the field though from the air the Nazis did play some havoc in peaceful Spanish cities. After Spain they turned to Europe and took Czechoslovakia with British consent, precisely as they burned the Reichstag, bled white the anti Nazis and assumed power while the British looked on sympathetically.

Chamberlain returned from Munich and said he had averted war and had Hitler's assurance that they didn't want it either. Hitler did not assure him that they were all a family of white nations, knit together by ties of race, and born to defeat the Bolsheviks and the colours. He did not reveal any hostile plan for the western people which he had flaunted about earlier. It seems he never had any. It was only a hostility towards some people, which they shared and which kept them together. When one of them grew strong and felt that he could face "his enemies", which were formerly "common enemies" that bond was cut. Germany had been in such a position since 1935. Since then she had been united with British conservatives less for sake of keeping front against common enemies (though their names figured quite a good deal) than for 'avoiding war between themselves' and there was

nothing between them that could not be solved by peaceful negotiation etc " For these three years they had been avoiding conflict Chamberlain said Hitler had told him it could still be avoided It could not be

You can no more remain friendly for long because you share feelings of hatred against some one else, than you can remain friendly because you believe that rupture should be avoided.

Avoidence of conflict is not a bond of friendship

After Munich they kept the Non intervention committee, which may be called " Non Democrat " committee alive for sometime, but there was no doubt it was dying, dying not because Germans and Italians had sabotaged it—that was nothing, the western countries were there to hide it, and they faithfully did so up to the last—but because they had awakened to the knowledge that German plane production was greater than that of England and France combined—that Germany had the biggest air force in Europe

Could there be a four power pact now ? asked the British conservatives Chamberlain still hoped He said Munich was something to begin with But tension remained in the air The Nazis were inflated with pride This was the second time that the British recognised their right to expand by affixing signature of a British statesman to the pact—the first time was the Naval treaty—and after that though the Germans exhibited their militarism in several ways and the British through the press or platform tacitly approved it, yet never had they signed any pact which confirmed the Nazi militarism—now within five years they had done it twice

The reactionaries in England were annoyed at Nazi impertinence because they felt that Hitler had got away with it.

Then a demented Jewish boy Hereschel Grysnapan murdered German ambassador's secretary in Paris, and in Berlin and elsewhere began reprisals on Jews—an orgy of violence and destruction which had never taken place so far under Nazi regime. The Britain press openly criticised it, even conservative papers prominently displayed news of Nazi atrocities. The papers which had feigned ignorance of slaughter by Nazis of Spanish republicans and their atrocities on people in Germany were now defenders of Jews.

The Nazi press retaliated venomously.

The spate of propaganda in the German press about the British empire, and the hysteric outbursts of sympathy which the people oppressed there had as much an unreal air about it as its counterpart in Britain carried on by Conservatives against the Nazis had. It was merely a case of pot calling the kettle black. At present we are not much concerned with the campaign of the former, that is the Conservatives. One could only say, that one welcomed their coming at that late hour on the side of the forces ranged for freedom, but they had to give a great proof of sincerity of their views in the coming days, which it appears they did not.

They were also directly responsible for the present campaign of calumny in Nazi press, against the empire of the British, for after eighteen years of the last war they had not given up the idea of Empire, and had ranged themselves on the side of the Nazi.

But whatever the British attitude was in the past, there was no justification for the Nazi campaign against the Jews in November 1938. This was the climax of their campaign against freedom minded peoples of that country. Though a section of Jews, did represent the vested interests, the unscientific mob violence was no way to expropriate them. Coming as

it did on heels of Nazis' past activities against free Germans, Spaniards, Indians, Chinese and Czechs, one could only take it as a drive against freedom in interest of the most hideous form of despotism that Europe had ever known

So what sort of sense did they want us to make out of their sympathy for people of Palestine Waziristan and South America expressed at that time in German papers? Palestine had been struggling for freedom for the past three years with crude and unscientific methods, yet there was a good deal to be said about the Arab case for having their own state in Palestine. Why had the Nazis waited for the British retaliation against November outrages to tell them what they had done in Palestine? There were stories in the British press that late in 1936, and after that German intriguers had been active in Palestine. In that case Nazi activities there could be understood as little better than mischief and a cynical desire to exploit the situation of the Arabs to further their own influence

The German Press in talking about Palestine now was displaying a similar cynical outlook. They were only ventilating their own wrath against the British for having wounded their *amourpropre* rather than sympathising with the Arabs

A country that was even in these days bombing the babies of Barcelave to pieces and blasting the buildings of that city, which had to its credit the "heroic" destruction of Guernica and Almorá, the latter *Deutschland* should not have taken upon itself the right to talk about British attitude in Palestine

The Palestine people were Asiatics, freedom loving folk, and they could scarcely forget Hitler's references to Asiatics in his speeches and writings. They knew

that he was the enemy of freedom and had defended in the past British methods of empire.

But the Nazis carried on this campaign on wide scale. Douglas Read who was at that time in Berlin testified to this fact in his book "Disgrace Abounding". He says :—"As I write, less than two months after Munich, there is in Germany a deadly campaign to inculcate hatred of England, the like of which has never been seen. It is kept out of your newspapers (British), save for scanty references, which mean nothing to you. There has never been anything so sustained, so laden with hatred in the world. In almost every newspaper one picks up, in almost every radio programme one hears, this hatred dinned into his soul. It is done at the order of a single man. He has pressed the button, and the whole gigantic machine has sprung into life. Why if there is eternal peace and goodwill between us?"

One wonders why had the Nazis singled out England for attack when there were other Imperialist countries at work cutting the throats of the oppressed, as for instance the Japanese in China, where Canton and Nanking had been razed to ground, and its population subjected to inhuman tortures.

The Dutch in East Indies, where they kept the natives like Koreans, the French in Algeria, Morocco Indo-China and of Italy in Abyssinnia. Why not turn round and attack them all if you believe that you were the freest men in the world and were unnecessarily maligned by the others, therefore you had begun a campaign for freedom of all people.

That would have meant eating back all the past utterances of Nazi revolution, which had come into being not to free, but enslave the world. For that they had built up a deadly machine of combat,

which was after reaching its perfection being applied against German citizens first and since some British papers had the temerity to point out to the world their action the Nazis had savagely attacked them.

Reed mentions once more stories of Nazi campaign against British treatment. In Palestine, which together with India had formed the main instrument of Nazi attack. The stories came from Palestine correspondent of German paper, who, thanks to British Consérvatives had found his way there, while Indian or British correspondents in Germany could scarcely enjoy such freedom. These correspondents, judged by honesty of some of them about reporting in Spain (which gave rise to Nazi press campaign and Hitler's speeches about murdered National Socialist children of Spain), must have regaled the Germans with strange blend of truth and falsehood. The "Völkischer Beobachter" according to Reed led this campaign. But this Nazi paper forgot that Hitler had in the past expressed the view :—

"If I think away this attitude of mind which in the course of the last three or four centuries has won the world for the white race, then the destiny of this race would in fact have been no different from that say of the Chinese, an immensely congested mass of human beings crowded upon an extraordinarily narrow territory, an over-population with all its unavoidable consequences. If fate allowed the white race to take a different path, that is only because this white race was convinced that it had the right to organise the rest of the world. It matters not so what superficial disguises in individual cases this right may have assumed, in practice it was the exercise of any extraordinarily brutal right to dominate

others, (Herrenrechtes) and from this political conception was developed the basis for the economic annexation of that world which was not inhabited by the white race".

The "superficial disguises" that this right to dominate others assumes sometimes, and which according to Hitler is a regrettable necessity, in order to make it easy for the oppressed to bear alien domination, is best illustrated by the campaign of the Nazis against the British. The Nazi sympathy for the victims of British rule is a disguised way of airing their own Imperialist ambitions, and paving way for their own domination over the world. When the leader of a party justifies British attitude and further says that it is necessary for all of them (including Germany) to follow such a method, how can you trust the organ of that party if it takes a sentimental view of the action of the British, and suddenly condemns them ?

We know from the case of Rudyard Kipling that this newspaper condemned "Kim" and the "Jungle Book" in 1935, as example of Anglo-Saxon "Imperialism" and headed the Nazi press in a campaign against that De'Annunzio of the British. And then a graveyard like silence came over German press. The Nazi controllers of press who had been flying this kite had suddenly switched on to panygerics of Britain for granting them Navy.

It showed that the Nazis were Imperialists first; and foremost and their aim was and is to destroy the freedom of India and dominate it.

It did not matter if every now and then they burst out in sympathy for us.

This force of mutual mud-flinging could be dismissed as lightly as the Kipling controversy was, if it was not to prove an entire departure from the past policy of the Nazis.

This Nazi courting of the people of the British empire was not this time a mere transitory phase; which was to end as soon as the tension of the November outrages was over. Relations with Britain had become strained, and there was no hope of any improvement in them. So there was no need to placate the British or take the old view about their empire, which was based on the principle that "you let us alone in Europe and we will give you free hand in your empire." The wheel had come a full circle.

Secretly they were negotiating with the Bolsheviks and wanted to reverse their policy about Russia as they did about us. It was however only a change in tactics. The strategy remained the same. The Bolsheviks as well as other Asiatics including Indians were the scum of the earth and the enemies of the Nazis, but Hitler had visualised a phase in German policy, when an alliance with Russia against Britain was possible. He had also said something about using the coloured people as an instrument in war against an alien state. He was fulfilling that policy.

He has since then deceived the Russians by treacherously attacking them in 1941. About India his professions of friendship cannot end otherwise.

An ominous warning about their intentions was conveyed to this country by the Nazis when they published in 1939 the nine point programme of empire building. As it happens, the anti-British campaign which had been continued since the November outrages, was revived with increased ferocity in March

1931, when the Nazis were attacked in the British press for occupying Bohemia and Moravia under Reich protection. The Nazis retaliated by recounting stories of British deeds in their empire. 'Der Angriff,' Dr. Goebel's paper published a past American cartoon showing John Bull standing and saying, "I never break a treaty." Behind him stands a small boy bearing a placard headed "England's broken treaties". Then follow names of Egypt, Transvaal, Persia, Tibet, Portugal and U S A, as the countries with whom the treaties were broken. The boy reminds John Bull by saying "Hey mister you lost your memory." The Manchester Guardian published this cartoon under the title, "As others see us."

It was all very funny and such cheap jibs at Britain could be picked up by dozens in the other Nazi papers. But somebody else beside Britain had lost his memory and while the Nazis were continuing the campaign of sympathy with Britain's victims, nine point programme of empire was published before which Britain's treaty breaking or dealing with India, Egypt etc paled into insignificance.

The Nazis had themselves let the cat out of bag. No amount of *Greuelmeldungen* about the British could blind us to what the Nazis wanted to do with that empire.

Not that it would have made any difference if they had not published this "blue book". Their intentions as outlined by Hitler previously, amply proved that there had been or could be ever a change in their attitude in favour of the Indians. But it shows the contempt in which the Nazis hold over intelligence. They are yet a long way off from being able to translate their nine point programme of keeping us educationally to the level of primitive, the jungle people which

they consider us to be, or robbing us of our industrial wealth and barring technical knowledge to our people—all these diabolic plans will never be achieved—but they imagine even now that the state of utter ignorance to which they wish to reduce us has already taken roots on our soil. They discreetly silenced all their criticism about Russia in the press in order to pave way for friendship with that country but they did not display such an ingenuity in case of the coloured people. Perhaps they thought that publishing of nine point programme could make no difference to the people of India and of other countries of Asia. They thought us too ignorant and too much centred over problems of our freedom to take into consideration such loopholes in Nazi strategy.

Or was it that they had so much deception to do and so many people to defraud the Germans the Russians, ourselves, that such cracks in a mighty strategy were inevitable? Be as it may, the Nazis had made a mistake, and we come to know of their war aims long before the war arrived. In an unguarded moment in between their campaign against England, they had told us for what they were worth. This Nazi charter of freedom given out at a time, when the Nazis, the British and ourselves were not in thick heat of war and could think dispassionately should rule out the possibility that any change had come in Nazi attitude towards India or in Indian view of Nazis.

## CHAPTER VI

### RIBBONTROP, LEY AND ROSENBERG

After Hitler, these three men have influenced most the Nazi attitude towards India. They have formed and still do the task of guiding the machinations of that country in world politics. Without mentioning them, no German view of India can be complete. The German press has represented the philosophy of these men. Dr Goebbels, who of course is omnipresent in all spheres of German activity has also influenced that policy, but it has not been particularly associated with his name, as the club footed dwarf has responsibility everywhere and no narrow loyalties to any particular branch of Nazi propaganda. Ribbontrop who has played the roll of Bismarck in framing Nazi Empire policy, is the man who has given practical shape to the racial mumbo jumbo of Hitler, which he thought he was sufficient for winning an empire. The son of a wealthy champagne merchant and Hitler's trusted ambassador in Britain, he was the man who told Hitler how utterly futile it was to build up a 100 per cent white bloc of the western countries. He was associated with that school of thought inside the Nazi party which wanted a rapprochement with Russia, and hostility towards Britain.

His anti British outlook considerably influenced his ideas of expanding Nazi Imperialism at the cost of Britain. The Treaty of 1935 was his personal triumph which won recognition from Britain of Germany's right to empire. When his career of ambassadorship

in England ended, he became head of the German foreign office and sought to keep British influence out of South Eastern Europe and Balkans. He succeeded in keeping Britain economically and politically out of the Balkans. Not that he had any sympathy for the semi-colonial condition in which the Balkan people lived. His policy was not to free them from shackles of British economic and hence political domination and allow them to stand on their own feet but to pave way for spread of German industry.

Ribbentrop's anti-British views were formed simply due to jealousy of wealth and prosperity of Britain and which he had seen during his stay in England, and was simply exciting him—a good Nazi to have all that wealth for his country. They had in Germany with little wealth planned so much, and made the life of the working classes much more comfortable than in England. They had bamboozled the middle class with ideas of patriotism, and assured them of their survival and progress with the rise of the Germanic state; the capitalist had been brought into Nazi fold with promise of expansion of *wirtschaft* overseas—only if they had the resources of the British what would they not do!

Such were the thoughts of Ribbentrop and in this way he proved to be useful instrument for furtherance of Nazi Imperialism. He was also the friend of Italy, which country he visited so many times to sign several pacts on behalf of Germany. He kept the German policy benevolently neutral towards Italy during the Abyssinian war. He signed a pact with Russia and betrayed it. Germany declared war on Russia in spite of the non-aggression pact. He signed anti-comintern pact with Japan and Italy and ditched both countries on signing the non-aggression pact with Russia. He

signed Anglo-German naval treaty limiting German navy upto 35% of the British Empire. Germany never kept that word.

Could this man with such a past of broken treaties and broken words, be trusted with harbouring any goodwill for India? Could his anti-British ideas be identified with anything except Imperialist rivalry, jealousy of one country for another, and a desire to keep Britain economically out of Balkans and carve out that area between Italy and Germany?

Ribbentrop's comments on the British Empire are hardly different from those of the German press which, official ridden as it was, represented faithfully the opinions of the Nazi ruling clique. That he was hardly different from that set of blood-thirsty Nazi tyrants, who had murdered thousands of freedom-minded Germans, abused the Indians and imprisoned liberals and those innocent citizens whom they were afraid to put to death, ...who had gloated over these crimes and drunk along with the British Conservatives, the health of the third Reich and the empire of the Blimps That Ribbentrop was one of them only somewhat more jealous of British wealth than other Nazis, was proved during his stay in England. In those days, the repression in Germany was going on at full swing. In England some sentimental liberals encouraged by the release of Dimitroff tried every now and then to secure freedom for several other such innocent people in Nazi clutches. Lord Allen of Hurtwood, a noted labour party leader asked Ribbentrop for release of a German barrister who had been wrongly confined.

Ribbentrop in keeping with traditions of his chief tried to frighten the British out of their wits by hair creeping stories of *Kultur Bolshevismus* spreading over

Europe. He said Dimitroff had been released and the result was that he became head of the third International, thus creating mischief in the world

He was sarcastic about Britain's sympathy for the oppressed Germany, and was one of the first prominent Germans to rebuke the British about their own Empire, and not meddle in German life, but instead try to understand the spirit of the great revolution sweeping over that country. Said Ribbentrop — "Germans understand the British feelings for the under dog and respect it from members of a similar race But precisely this sense of community between similar races and similar blood should be a guarantee for the joint recognition that reasons of state often compel hard paths to be trodden without a people abandoning its inner fundamental ethical and philosophical character On the contrary these hard paths often created a condition for the maintenance of people's ethical and philosophical principles Present day England had somewhat failed to recognise this but I believe these ideas are becoming more and more effective from day to day, and the history of British Empire should be the best teacher in this respect "

The insolent assertion of the superiority of German race is there, the high handedness against political opponents is justified on the ground of philosophical and ethical principles of the great German nation, and finally he trails off with a meaningless jib against British Empire

Only people of similar race may criticise the Germans, and they respected this criticism for that reason if it came from outside Germany Inside that country, Nordic Germans criticising the government did so at their own risk and with hangman's axe held over their neck

Ribbentrop inspite of his polished diplomatic manners and extensive travel is incapable of taking a balanced view on racial questions or in any way differs from the Nazi policy of brute force against the oppressed. Like Hitler he justifies it on the ground that it is necessary for the functioning of the philosophical and ethical principles of Nazism.

To have a critical view of England, and further help in permeating this philosophy among the Nazis, is not the same as criticism of England from liberal or Democratic stand-point. A Nazi may be as prejudiced against the British as Ribbentrop is, and he may be still far removed from the democratic or liberal tradition, which alone can help us [in analysing the peculiar social structure of Britain and its reactionary outlook in Empire and world affairs.

But Ribbentrop who displays all the crudity of Faqir of Ipi and Grand Mufti of Jerusalem in his tirades against Britain, has no justification in his campaign. He is a seasoned diplomat, citizen of a country with a high level of education. If he talks like Faqir of Ipi about Britain, and further indulges in mythological racial jargon which the Pir does not, though he might be in his tribes asserting his own racial superiority as crudely as Ribbentrop does, then we can draw only one conclusion; and that is, he wants British Imperialism to be substituted by a more sophisticated delivery, what Reinhold Neibenur called "Synthetic Barbarism."

Like his chief Hitler, he does not preclude possibility of a "Joint recognition that reasons of state often compel hard paths to be trodden, without a people abandoning its inner fundamental, ethical and philosophical character", though he cannot claim that mastery over the art of playing with feelings of others,

which Hitler has and can scarcely control his savage feelings of hatred against England.

Later in November, 1938, when German press was screaming about British Empire, Ribbentrop is quoted by Douglas Reed as saying —

"Slowly but surely the whole world is sinking. No agitation, no calumny, no terror can arrest the course of Germany. What will come one day out of the collapse of the old social order in other countries, what will arise on the ruins of this old crumbling world? We do not know." Where did he pick up all this talk about "crumbling old social order"? Where if not from Moscow whose ideas were now no longer held in awe by the Germans, and they had begun to copy Bolshevik jargon in some respects. Probably he was training himself in such talks before his flight to Moscow next year. Alas! this benevolence of the Nazis towards Bolsheviks and copying of their jargon of attack on western capitalism and appeasement of the German working class, was only a temporary phase. The Nazi could never think of any social order arising on the ruins of the old systems except that which accepted the superiority of the German race. Did not Ribbentrop make a much clearer when he said that "no agitation, no calumny, no terror could arrest the course of Germany"? That course was *Deutschland Uber alles*, or Germany over all. Why then hide it in borrowed phraseology about 'the sinking of the old world, 'the crumbling of the old social order,' etc., etc.?

Another German leader who followed Ribbentrop's and Goebbels' tricks of stealing weapons from the Communist armoury for the same reasons was Dr Robert Ley the Nazi labour front leader. We were introduced to him when we took up the problem of German *wirtschaft* in the Balkans, how it expanded

under leadership of Ley, Rosenberg and Ribbentrop, and the tricks the labour Front leader had played in those countries in order to impoverish both the capitalist and the worker there and thus benefit their prototypes in Germany. It was pointed out, these tricks were likely to be repeated when he dealt with India.

That was true, Ley who had all along deceived the German workers, and Balkan people after the war and the signing of Russo-German pact took up the campaign against "Capitalist Imperialism" of England and France.

Robert Ley is one of those German leaders who have found Imperialism of their country much more fascinating than socialism, in which they never believed but copied certain phrases of Socialists of U.S.S.R. to fool the German workers and the people living in other parts of the world, struggling for their political and economic freedom.

These labour leaders who could not fit into any socialist society, and who as a result of their failures in working class movements turn to Imperialism and glorify it, are the worst type of Fascists and most dangerous for the Socialists and the coloured people of the world. So there is no doubt that each of these Nazi beasts has his technique of approach to us. Hitler tries to dazzle us with the might of the Germany, cleverly hiding his own intentions.

Ribbentrop plays with our sentiments by savagely attacking Britain and turning his hostility towards that country into Anglo-phobia so that we should take him for a heroic figure among the Germans.

We know that his Anglo-phobia has nothing to do with sober criticism of England based on socialist

or liberal Democratic tradition Robert Ley appeals to the working class over the head of their Governments He is not satisfied with giving German workers comfortable living at the expense of the countries overrun by Germany He would enslave the colonial countries to enable the German worker and the capitalist to flourish

We now know this miserable frustrated German labour Front leader for what he is worth He is not satisfied with that domination over several countries which Germany has got now He wanted her to have begun dominating over the world three centuries ago German policy according to him has been in these 300 years aimed at recovering her lost position of leadership among the nations of the world

That was the sort of talk which could rally the public opinion in Germany especially when Nazis had schooled those people in policy of Imperialism and glorification of war since 1932

But with passage of time German tactics changed The work of solidarity with European labour which formerly Ley carried-on with appeals against Anglo-Saxon capitalism was now in hands of *wehrmacht*, which finding that proud workers of these territories had not been much amenable to Ley's intrigues resorted to forced labour The working classes of occupied countries were hostile to the Nazis regime With coming of Russia in war that hostility became universal

There was now little chance of Nazi labour front tactics succeeding either in Europe or in territories inhabited by coloured people The British conservatives could not help them by bracketing them with communists, for Russia's coming into war

had made a separate peace with Nazis difficult in view of the solidarity of the working classes of western countries with Russian workers.

On the other hand, the Nazis had built up such a big system of Empire that the old talk of Anglo-Saxon capitalism robbing the workers of the world seemed absurd. Ley's figures appealing to the workers of the world, while his speeches at home were blatantly Imperialist looked ridiculous even in 1939 and 1940, but to-day this man seems to fade into background.

He continuously talked and no doubt still does about the Germans building up the new social order of the world. They will not. His place is not in the future society of humanity but in the past glories of German militarism, which he has boasted to be the oldest in the world. He can live in that past.

The world of hatred and frustration is the place which can prove comfortable to labour leaders like himself, who failed to identify their interest with the workers or stick to their traditions.

He is one of those so-called German labour leaders, who like the Strasser brothers came inside the Nazi Party hoping that it would open out a new heaven for the German workers; who was clever enough to escape from June, 1934, purge with his neck and who ended by making himself and the German workers tools in hands of the Imperialists for enslavement of the world.

Alfred Rosenberg who writes in his paper "*Völkischer Beobachter*" also like Robert Ley derives his inspiration from the past. The German Aryan culture which was according to these people best represented by the Teutonic knights who were

ravaging Poland and its environs about the time Mahmud Gaznavi was carrying on his hit and run raids in this land; was the life ideal of this man. Born in that North Eastern tip of Europe in Estonia, which culturally as well as Geographically is a kind of Europe's Korea while its adjacent countries Lithuania and Latvia, similarly backward and bone of contention of the European powers may be described as Manchukuo and inner Mongolia; Rosenberg, reflects its influence in his ideas. He has been always looking Eastward of Germany into Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Finland, Russia, Balkans and further East in Turkey and India for spread of his ideas. He came from Eastern Europe and having imbibed deeply the influence of Germany, he has been torn between the loyalty to the East and the West and has tried to blend his philosophy into the Aryan culture which, according to his faith, unites the Aryans of these lands with Germans. That is his typical method of propaganda. Both Ribbentrop and Ley have their own methods of approaching the oppressed people of colonial countries and the working class. Rosenberg's technique is winning over a part of the population of those countries into alliance with Germany by telling them about superiority of Aryan culture of the Nordic race over that of other races.

Some of the so-called "Swamis" of the International Aryan League of India, who visited Germany before the war had an opportunity to meet several of these Rosenberg's culture experts, who assured them the Aryans in India were of the same race as the Germans and for this reason they were respected in Germany. All this was flagrantly in contradiction with past utterances of Nazi leaders but some. how these woollyheaded gentlemen of the Aryan

league believed in all that they were told by the culture experts. It never occurred to these men, nor we believe it does to-day that it was part of Rosenberg's technique which he used for disarming suspicions of the people abroad.

The economic and political conquest of Balkans was carried out by this process of internal disintegration which Rosenberg sought to introduce in India through those "Aryans" who were victims of his teaching.

Hitler and Rosenberg have no more respect for the Aryans of India; than they had for those of Finland, Sweden, Norway and Denmark countries inhabited by the people of Nordic Aryan blood. All these countries except Sweden have been either conquered or enslaved. In Balkans, the Nordic Aryans who lived there were instruments of enslaving of those lands.

Rosenburg knows that a strong feeling exists in India against the lower caste people, the untouchables and scarcely veiled contempt of the people of North for the Dravidians of the South. It would be the triumph of the Nazi policy if such feelings of hostility could be created here against these people which existed in Germany, against the Jews.

But it cannot be that any amount of deceptive talk by Rosenberg would make us forget the fate of Nordic countries of Europe or Hitler's views about Indians which were freely aired in the paper which Rosenberg founded "Völkischer Beobachter" and which were latter embodied in "Mein Kampf" ?

Can it make much difference if Rosenberg has not himself said anything against India, and

has harped on sentimental campaign of "Aryan collaboration when he has been actively associated with anti Indian policy, and has been the main instrument of the cultural Blitzkrieg in European countries before the actual military occupation. Who if not Rosenberg framed the "cultural" programme for the natives embodied in Nazi Nine point plan of Empire-building which forcibly sought to keep them for ever as much backward and compressed into a small territory hedged in on by great powers as his birthplace Estonia was? Hitler has always laid down broad outlines of his plan about Empire India, coloured people. The details have been filled by his experts-one of them is Alfred Rosenberg. So the responsibility for the cultural plans of the Nazis is mainly that of Rosenberg's.

The way '*Völkischer Beobachter* has shifted its policy about India should clear up his attitude still further. As that paper has been playing with India's Nationalist sentiments by every now and then holding up British conduct to ridicule and then either lapsing into prolonged silence or planning how best the Nazis could have India, so Rosenberg talks about Aryan unity when it suits the Nazis to flatter the "Aryas" of India and for the rest of the time he is the moving spirit of the '*Völkischer Beobachter* or one of three big Nazi-schemers for Empire expansion.

## CHAPTER VII INDIA IN GERMANY TO-DAY

German attitude towards India to-day remains much as it was after Munich. Undeterred by the fact that German Press Campaign in 1938 and 1939 proved quite a "flop" so far as India was concerned, the Nazis continue to make bids for winning popularity in the East. Hitler has to-day in Berlin mustered round him the very Asiatic mountbanks (such men are not uncommon among the Nazi party too) against whom he railed in "Mein Kampf" and in German Press in the days when he was yet struggling for power. There is a good deal of "jabbering" done by such Indian "Lord-Haw-Haws" on the ether in Germany these days, but the Fuehrer would scarcely call them "Jabbering-orientals", or "chatterboxes" for that very reason. When anybody dances faithfully to the Nazi tune, the Pundits of that party do not indulge in recriminations against him. No doubt then the Fuehrer who is unrivalled in the art of self-deception tolerates these men, and even applauds them. These new phase in Nazi *orient politik* i.e., of using Indian Lord Haw-Haws, on the ether began after war, when the radio had been developed as an instrument of warfare. The Nazis used this technique successfully in their campaign in France when those who mourned the *maginot* line, were told of French defeats and thus demoralised. After the fall of France, the French Colonial Empire, including territories in Africa and Middle East became the victims of Nazi propaganda and under cover of the Armistice Commission infiltration of Nazi agents in those countries began.

The influence of the Nazis was strongest in the year 1940 and 1941 when the Americans tried to oust them from North Africa and did at last succeed in that effort. The process of extermination of Nazis is being carried out there till now.

In the Middle East Nazi propaganda centre which was incidentally used for campaign all over the adjoining countries including India and Afghanistan the process of liquidation of enemy agents was long and laborious. The brain behind all these activities here—the man who may be described as ‘Asia’s Enemy No 1’ was Baron Franz Von Papen, the Nazi ambassador to Turkey. This Prussian Junker, who carried on intrigues in various European capitals especially Vienna could be equalled in his cunning only by Herr Abetz in Paris, or Ribbentrop while he was in London. The technique employed in the countries of the Middle East was same as in case of the Balkans namely using of German consuls in various places to further the nefarious activities of the Nazi Party. The machinery of assault in this case was mainly directed against industrialists who were won over by baits of trade boom. It was as in Balkans. There the Germans offered machinery to captains of industry in return for products of the soil and thus cemented trade relations. Once this was done, a net-work of Nazi touring agencies could be established from where their agents fanned out spreading mischief. Another method was to enter the country to aid the industry by sending large number of German technicians. The *Manchester Guardian* discussing the activities of these Nazis in Iran, Afghanistan, and borders of India, wrote in August, 1941 —

“A vast German fifth column is operating in Iran

and Afghanistan in according to an Eastern Correspondent of the Independent French News Agency. The diplomatic representatives of Great Britain and Soviet Russia are at present engaged in Teheran and Kabul in combating the subterranean activities of this fifth column. Utilising these two centres as basis German agents, and Saboteurs are infiltrating into the neighbouring territories of the Soviet Caucasian Republics, the republics of and Turkestan, as well as to the North-West Frontier of India.

Accidents appear to be attributed to sabotage in Industrial centres in the Caucasia have led to increased vigilance by the Soviet authorities. Great Britain is specially concerned, it is understood with safeguarding of the refineries and oil wells of the Anglo-Persian Company in South Iran.....

The Soviet and British Agents have drawn the attention of the Iranian Government to the dangerous activities of German Agents who are trying to enlist the support of Iranian subjects trading in Soviet and British territories. It is noted that twice in a period of six weeks Afghan Government has made a point in determination to maintain strict neutrality.

Nevertheless certain groups of young Afghans have been won over to Nazi ideas and are playing the game of the local Nazis."

From the above news in *Manchester Guardian* it appears that the Nazi infiltration in the Middle East right upto the North-West Frontier of India was in those days widespread. However a death blow was struck to the machinations of the third Reich in this area with Russian and British Military action in Iran which was aimed at not conquest of the country, but elimination of the Nazi Agents, and establishment of a strong independent and patriotic Government in Iran which should, for all times, suppress Nazi activities.

Similarly, in Syria and Iraq the stooges of Hitler were either put to flight or liquidated on the spot. The Vichyist hold ended in Syria.

But Afghanistan and Turkey still remain open to Nazi intrigues. So far relations with Turkey have been very cordial and there could be no doubt that for some time it appeared that the days of men like Baron Franz Von Papen were numbered and his countrymen could not carry on their intrigues in that last middle class republic in Europe. But lately relations between Turkey and the United Nations have not been happy one and it would be much better if both with this country as well as Afghanistan the United Nations should have some agreement affirming the policy of strict vigilance over the axis agents.

The victorious onward sweep of the Red Army would have repercussion in these countries which are Russia's next day neighbours. They would no doubt cherish friendship of that country dear and would be willing to collaborate with it in maintaining peace in Middle East, and preventing it from falling a prey to the German Imperialism. But apart from this the United Nations should benefit from Nazi technique and see to it that the Germans should no longer be able to offer any bait to the people in this region. After the Tehran conference, America, England and Russia affirmed the territorial integrity and independence, of Iran. That was a step in right direction, and would make it clear that Iran is a willing partner in the line-up against the Nazis in the Middle East.

The next step would be economic-rehabilitation-of-not only Iran, but all countries in this zone.

If the Germans could supply machinery to these countries so should the United Nations do. After the last war Russians organised Turkish Industry.

Now all the United Nations could take part in this reorganisation of Industry. Technicians could also be supplied to these countries at the end of war and the middle class youth of Afghanistan, who according to *Manchester Guardian* took great interest in Nazi propaganda could be sent to Russia, England or America for education, technical or otherwise, so that on their return, they should be able to take part in Industrialisation of their country.

That would be the right reply to Hitler.

What is true of the countries across over North-West borders is true of India. Here, too, similar plans have to be adopted by the United States to collaborate with people of the country in economic rehabilitation, supplying machinery, etc, for the industry. As for the Indian Lord Haw Haws screaming over the ether in Germany, they are not likely to have much effect on the people of this country. The people here cannot forget Hitler's attitude towards this country in early days of his struggle; his diatribes in "Mein Kampf" and other speeches in Germany encouraging the idea of Balkanising India. They know that in the last war certain Prussian Nationalists were sympathetic to this country, but when Hitler began to spread his *Weltanschauung* in Germany these very Nationalists joined hands with him, and shared his anti-Indian views before the war. They know that this country let down once could be let down again. That the Prussian Junkers, or Hitler's Nazis cannot be relied upon.

The Nazis are like the Prussians of the last war only a phase of the vast revolution that has been sweeping over Germany since the defeat of the Prussians at the hands of Napoleon in the battle of Jena. The Germans have yet to adjust themselves to a political system in their state, before they can look towards such a far off country as India, and formulate a lasting policy of peace and amity with it.

## OUR OTHER PUBLICATIONS.

	Rs.	As.
1. The Bengal Tragedy, by Tushar Kanti Ghosh ...	2	8
2. The Indian Struggle, by Prof. Darbara Singh ...	3	4
3. America Imperialist or Democrat, By the author of India between the two wars ...	1	8
4. Failure of Provincial Autonomy in India, By F. C. Mehta M. A. ...	1	14
5. Mother Land, By C. N. Zutshi ...	2	4
6. India's Fight for Freedom, by Sardul Singh Caveesher ...	3	14
7. Personality and Political Ideas of Subhas Bose Is he Fascist? By Hira Lal Seth ...	1	14
8. Gandhi in Arms, by Hira Lal Seth ..	0	12
9. Churchill on India, by Hira Lal Seth (Bound) 2nd edition	1	14

## BIOGRAPHIES.

1. Madame Chiang Kai Shek. (The greatest woman of the world) by Prof. J. Bright ...	2	8
2. Mr. Allah Bux (India's Nationalist No. 1) by Prof. J. Bright ...	0	12
3. Tagore (The Sentinel of the East) by Durlab Singh ...	2	0
4. Sardar Vallabhai Patel, (The Iron Dictator) by H. L. Seth ...	1	14
5. Subhas Bose (The Rebel President), by Durlab Singh ...	2	0
6. Jawahar Lal Nehru (The Red Star of the East), by H. L. Seth ...	1	14
7. Allama Mashraqi (The Khaksar Leader), by H. L. Seth ...	1	4
8. Master Tara Singh (The Akali Leader), by Durlab Singh ...	2	4
9. Sir Stafford Cripps. (Let his past records speak) ...	0	4

Hero Publications

6, Lower Mall,  
Lahore.

*Any book not available at any local bookstall can be had direct from the publishers at Lahore.*